

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8705) granting an increase of pension to Kitty A. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8706) granting a pension to Jemima A. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2415. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of American Civil Liberties Union, New York City, N. Y., favoring the immediate recognition by the United States of the Philippine Islands as an independent State; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2416. Also (by request), petition of members and friends of the National Woman's Party meeting at national headquarters, Capitol Hill, Washington, D. C., requesting Congress to submit to the State legislatures for their approval the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2417. By Mr. BOYCE: Petition of the Consumers' League of Delaware, Wilmington, Del., favoring the adoption of proposed child labor amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2418. Also, petition of Sabbath School, First Central Presbyterian Church, Wilmington, Del., approving and indorsing the Permanent Court of International Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2419. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of the board of directors of the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce, approving the provisions of the national defense act, providing for a citizens' army, and for an appropriation by Congress of the sum of not less than \$6,000,000,000 to meet the requirements designated by the act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2420. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Thomson-Crocker Shoe Co., Boston, Mass., protesting against the passage of the shoe tag bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2421. Also, petition of Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass., recommending that the Newton bill, now pending, be modified so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission, upon complaint that adequate facilities are not afforded at any port or ports, to rescind the application of section 28 as to any such port or ports if the public interest and the advantage and convenience of the commerce of the people warrant such action; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2422. Also, petition of the Hillson Co., Boston, Mass., protesting against the proposed tax on mah jong games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2423. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of the Detroit Council of Postal Associations, Detroit, Mich., favoring the Kelly-Edge bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2424. By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: Petition of citizens of the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, in behalf of Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2425. Also, petition of Chicago Lithuanians, opposing the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2426. By Mr. McSWEENEY: Papers to accompany House bill 7431, granting a pension to Raymond E. Fisher, late of Troop K, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry; to the Committee on Pensions.

2427. By Mr. SITES: Petition of Harrisburg Camp, No. 8, United Spanish War Veterans, Harrisburg, Pa., dated March 28, 1924, indorsing the proposed legislation to increase the pensions of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1924

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 10, 1924)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Fletcher	McKellar
Bayard	Frazier	McKinley
Borah	George	McLean
Brandegee	Gerry	McNary
Broussard	Glass	Mayfield
Bruce	Gooding	Moses
Bursum	Hale	Neely
Cameron	Harrell	Norbeck
Capper	Harris	Norris
Caraway	Harrison	Oddie
Colt	Heflin	Overman
Copeland	Howell	Pepper
Cummins	Johnson, Minn.	Phelps
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman
Dale	Kendrick	Ralston
Dial	Keyes	Reed, Pa.
Edge	King	Robinson
Edwards	Ladd	Sheppard
Ernst	Lodge	Shields
Fernald	McCormick	Shipstead

Shortridge
Simmons
Smith
Smoot
Spencer
Stanfield
Stephens
Sterling
Swanson
Trammell
Underwood
Wadsworth
Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.
Warren
Weller
Willis

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] owing to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

I also wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] on account of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

I was requested to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent in attendance upon hearings before a special investigating committee of the Senate.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHBURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. GLASS. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, purely on the assumption that none of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber and none of the representative leaders of my party outside of the Chamber will want to be held responsible for the address which I ventured to make yesterday I want to correct a newspaper statement with reference to it.

I find in the New York Evening Post of yesterday, as well as in the Washington Star, a statement which has the caption:

GLASS berates President in bitter speech after conference with party chiefs. Address considered significant as representing planned minority move.

In the text of the article it is stated that—

it became known, as the Senator was speaking, that he had decided on the major points of his address after a conference with a group of influential men of his party, both in and out of Congress.

Mr. President, the only group that knew anything about my speech was the group of women stenographers employed in my office to whom the speech was dictated. Not a living human being on this side of the Chamber or out of the Chamber had notice of a word that I would utter until it was spoken.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Virginia made the statement he has just made, though it was quite needless, for I do not believe anyone who knows the Senator from Virginia would suppose he was making a "group" speech for anyone.

I dislike extremely to take any time which ought to be devoted to the business now before the Senate. I have tried to avoid making any speeches because it seems to me the first duty of the Senate is to dispose of the very important legislation now pending. The immigration bill which we have before us at this moment is a bill of the greatest possible importance to the people of the United States. It will have an effect upon the qualities of American citizenship in years to come when we all have passed away.

But, Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia made a speech yesterday criticizing, as he had an entire right to do, the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. I have no suggestion of fault to make with the manner of the speech, for the Senator from Virginia knows very well how to be severe and parliamentary at the same time. But it seems to me to be a speech of such importance that I do not think I can allow it to pass without any comment at all.

The Senator from Virginia is not one of those who ever for a moment mistakes lungs and language for a speech. His speeches

are always able, eloquent, show a great deal of thought, and are powerful presentations of his view of an important subject before the Senate in which he is interested. I am not given to meaningless compliments, which are so frequent in this body, but I not only have a great respect for the Senator from Virginia but I shall always recall, while I still hold a seat here, one speech he made on the settlement of the British debt which I can say without exaggeration, after a good many years of experience, was one of the most impressive and important speeches I have ever heard made in this body. Therefore all he said on the matter of the message which the President sent to the Senate and on the letter which accompanied it, written by the Secretary of the Treasury, is of moment.

I desire to comment upon and sustain the President's message to which the junior Senator from Virginia devoted a large part of his attention. I hold in my hand the message of the President of the United States to which he referred.

Mr. President, in the first place, I do not think there is any possible ground for attempting to find fault with the President because he communicates his views on a matter like the subject of this message directly to the Senate. Our history shows that Presidents have never hesitated under the authority given them by the Constitution to communicate to Congress or to give their views on many subjects, and especially on any which they have believed affected injuriously the administration of the Government. Anyone who is curious on this matter might refresh his memory by reading some of the Senate debates during the administration of Andrew Jackson, and especially those relating to what is known as the resolution of censure which was passed by the Senate and the subsequent resolution, when the Democrats had regained control of the Senate, to expunge the former resolution of censure. I may say there were some personalities in both instances, and the action taken by the Senate in passing both the resolution of censure and then the subsequent resolution to expunge the censure seems to me, as a mere question of history, to have been entirely futile.

Presidents have exercised a wide discretion on the subjects upon which they may communicate with the Senate. As recently as the administration of President Wilson, Mr. Wilson came here and addressed the Senate on the subject of a constitutional amendment in connection with which, under the Constitution, the President has no part. No fault was found with his doing so, and I see no reason to find any. The recent message of the President relates directly to the conduct of the public business, with which the President is charged as Chief Executive.

The President begins by stating that—

There exists, and always should exist, every possible comity between the executive departments and the Senate. Whatever may be necessary for the information of the Senate or any of its committees, in order better to enable them to perform their legislative or other constitutional functions, ought always to be furnished willingly and expeditiously by any department. The executive branch has nothing that it would wish to conceal from any legitimate inquiry on the part of the Senate. But it is recognized both by law and by custom that there is certain confidential information which it would be detrimental to the public service to reveal.

The right of the Executive to refuse to send documents, papers, or other information to the Senate if he regards sending them as incompatible with the public interest is an authority which the Executive must exercise; he must have that power in all completeness. There are many things in his charge which it would be detrimental to the public interest to publish. In every resolution that passes the Senate, which is addressed to the President, and which relates to foreign affairs, I think, the clause "if not incompatible with the public interest" is always inserted. In fact, I think there is no question as to the authority of the Executive over papers and information in any department of the Government which are in his charge and which must be in his charge. The President in his message continues:

Such information as can be disclosed I shall always unhesitatingly direct to be laid before the Senate. I recognize also that it is perfectly legitimate for the Senate to indulge in political discussion and partisan criticism.

But the attack which is being made on the Treasury Department goes beyond any of these legitimate requirements.

Certainly if there is anything under our system of government which should be within the direct control of the Executive, so far as correspondence and information go, it should be the Treasury Department. We have laws providing for holding private certain papers and documents relating to taxes which are under the jurisdiction of the Treasury. Whether that is

wise, as a general law, is a question which Congress can decide, but that it is the law to-day is beyond doubt.

After stating—

But the attack which is being made on the Treasury Department goes beyond any of these legitimate requirements—

The President then states—

Seemingly the request for a list of the companies in which the Secretary of the Treasury was alleged to be interested, for the purpose of investigating their tax returns, must have been dictated by some other motive than a desire to secure information for the purpose of legislation.

I think there can be no question in the mind of anybody that the purpose of that request could not have been otherwise than to inquire into the character of the Secretary of the Treasury himself. The President then continues:

The Senate resolution appointing this committee is not drawn in terms which purport to give any authority to the committee to delegate their authority or to employ agents and attorneys.

I believe that is undoubtedly true.

The appointment of an agent and attorney to act in behalf of the United States but to be paid by some other source than the Public Treasury is in conflict with the spirit of section 1764 of the Revised Statutes, the act of March 3, 1917.

The constitutional and legal rights of the Senate ought to be maintained at all times. Also the same must be said of the executive departments. But these rights ought not to be used as a subterfuge to cover unwarranted intrusion. It is the duty of the Executive to resist such intrusion and to bring to the attention of the Senate its serious consequences.

Mr. President, I think it was well within the province of the President to call attention to what he regards and what many people regard as going beyond the legitimate rights of the Senate itself. I have always during my service here supported to the best of my ability the rights and prerogatives of the Senate; I think I have often been considered rather a stickler on that point; I certainly have been criticized for my attitude at times when we had a President of a different party; but I have also always believed that the rights of the other branches of the Government should be equally observed and that we who stand for our own rights very vigorously, as we should, should be extremely careful not to invade the rights of the other two departments of the Government, either the executive or the judicial. That division of powers and that observance of rights applies to all the departments of the Government equally, and I think in this particular case, as to the committee to which the President refers, the proposition of the subcommittee went clearly beyond the rights of the Senate.

Mr. President, in regard to the point that was especially made concerning the employment of counsel to be paid by an individual Senator, which action was approved by the subcommittee, there is this to be considered: Wholly apart from the statute, it has never been the practice here, to my knowledge, for any committee to employ attorneys—which is, I think, very rarely done—or other outside assistance without a direct order from the Senate itself. The committee is a creature of the Senate; it is made by the Senate and intended to represent the Senate, and therefore all power for the expenditure of money by a committee must come through the Senate. That is recognized in every resolution which we adopt authorizing an inquiry. Having an attorney paid by an individual member and not responsible to the committee, again apart from the statute, seems to me an impossible policy for any great legislative body to adopt.

I can not believe that it is the intention of the full committee or of the Senate to allow any such step to be taken. In fact, under the resolution as it passed, there is no such authority given by the Senate. That is a question which must be decided. It is not necessary at this time to go over the points that may be raised under the statute. I think the statute against payment by outsiders would cover any "Government employee," which is a very broad term. If strictly enforced, it would no doubt, in my judgment, prevent Senators from hiring or engaging persons to help them in their offices.

To take another example, I can not see how we have a right to provide that men doing overtime work, either in the night inspection of immigrants or in the inspection and examination of goods in vessels arriving at night, shall be paid directly or indirectly by the vessels requiring those overtime services. I introduced myself, without giving proper attention to the act—indeed, without recalling it—a bill to give overtime pay to customhouse inspectors. They ought to have it. They are miserably underpaid now, and so are the immigration inspectors;

But if this law is to be enforced with the utmost rigidity it will have to be modified. The same is true, I should think, of the traffic police in the city of Washington, whom year after year Congress has permitted to be paid by the railroad companies in order that we may have traffic policemen, especially at the crossings. Even those cases require modification of the law if it is to be rigidly enforced, and it ought to be modified in those certain directions; but, Mr. President, this case is one that it seems to me no modification ought to cover. There can be no doubt that an attorney employed in an investigation by a committee of the Senate represents the Senate itself to that extent; and, whatever we do, the proposition of the subcommittee ought not to be concurred in.

To that the President called attention, and the Secretary of the Treasury still more sharply. When the President, then, referred to intrusion, he referred, of course, to bringing in an outsider, and apparently giving him the right to make public certain papers, not only in disregard of the law on the subject, but apparently relieving him from that law by resolution of the Senate alone, which I do not think can be done. There are many papers, some covered by law, some not, which it would be utterly impossible and wrong for the Executive to send in for publication in the newspapers of the United States, for that is what it amounts to.

The President says:

Under a procedure of this kind the constitutional guaranty against unwarranted search and seizure breaks down, the prohibition against what amounts to a Government charge of criminal action without the formal presentment of a grand jury is evaded, the rules of evidence which have been adopted for the protection of the innocent are ignored, the department becomes the victim of vague, unfounded, and indefinite charges, and instead of a government of law we have a government of lawlessness. Against the continuation of such a condition I enter my solemn protest, and give notice that in my opinion the departments ought not to be required to participate in it. If it is to continue, if the Government is to be thrown into disorder by it, the responsibility for it must rest on those who are undertaking it. It is that we returned to a government under and in accordance with the usual forms of the law of the land. The state of the Union requires the immediate adoption of such a course.

That is strongly stated, but it is in defense of the undoubted Executive rights, and it merits my full concurrence. I do not see how it can be distorted into an insult or even an incivility to the Senate. The Senate has been extending in various directions its activities or, certainly, its practices. In the language of the newspapers it has created a new office, which is called "the committee prosecutor." Being the high court of impeachment before which the House of Representatives alone can appear as bringing the impeachment, it has sent to the House a resolution—which, constitutionally, I suppose, it had an entire right to do—in which, substantially, it invites the House to impeach a given person—a collector of customs, I believe, somewhere on the border in Texas—and then, if the House impeaches that person, the court which has sent the resolution to the House is going to try the accused—a mere mockery of justice. It may be all constitutional. I did not oppose it. I thought it was just as well to let it get through, because no one was disposed to hinder investigations, and also because I felt a reasonable assurance, without knowing anything about it, that the House of Representatives were not devoid of a sense of humor, and that we should never hear any more of the solemn resolution of the Senate.

We have now undertaken in a subcommittee to permit the payment of attorneys who represent the Senate itself by an individual Senator. It might just as well be by an outsider. Against those things the President of the United States has protested. He has protested in vigorous language. He has protested because he feels strongly about what he regards, rightly or wrongly, as an invasion of Executive rights. He has stated a complete recognition of the rights of the Senate, but he has condemned the procedure by which those rights are being exercised in the Senate, and I think he was entirely justified in doing so.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator from Massachusetts justify the interpretation placed upon the President's message and the purpose attributed to it by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that is something I do not undertake to answer. I was not here when the speech was delivered, and I know nothing about it.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator, of course, has read it?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I have read such portions as appeared in the newspapers.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Indiana stated to the Senate that he had conferred with the President, and expressed the conclusion that there is an intention to investigate the prohibition unit in the Internal Revenue Bureau, and that that fact is the occasion for criticism of the Senate's course and the course of the committee of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, of that I know nothing. I am not fond of nor do I give weight to hearsay evidence, which has been very popular in the Senate for some time. I am taking what the President said and for which he is responsible, not what somebody else said he said.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator be kind enough to yield to another question or two?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has placed what appears to me and what I believe appears to the press of the country to be a very narrow construction upon the President's message, and consequently has given a narrow application to it. He has indicated that it is confined solely to criticism of the arrangement for the employment of Mr. Heney, and to objections to the alleged purpose of the committee to require the publication of confidential records in the Department of the Treasury. Does not the Senator think that, considering the message as a whole, it is an expression of resentment toward the general policy of the Senate as revealed in the investigations now in progress under the order of the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. I do not so read it. I think it is perfectly clear what he is objecting to.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the objection is to the employment of an attorney by an individual member of the Senate committee, it is perfectly clear that if it is desirable that the committee be authorized to employ attorneys, that action can be taken very promptly by the Senate. Does the Senator from Massachusetts favor supporting the resolution of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] and its passage through the Senate—the resolution authorizing the committee to employ counsel and experts?

Mr. LODGE. I think if proper limitations are put on the employment I shall be in favor of it.

Mr. ROBINSON. What limitations would the Senator suggest?

Mr. LODGE. That no one shall be allowed to name an attorney except the committee, and that no money shall be paid except by the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the committee should be authorized to make the employment, it would follow as a matter of course that the employment must be by the committee, would it not?

Mr. LODGE. By the committee, subject to the approval of the Senate. I should wish to put that in.

Mr. ROBINSON. Was that course ever taken before in authorizing a committee of the Senate to employ counsel?

Mr. LODGE. I dare say not; but a great many things have been done at this session that never have happened before.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator, then, is in favor of an unusual and extraordinary course in authorizing the employment of this counsel? He would make the attorney the employee of the Senate rather than of the committee?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I think it would be an improvement.

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the occasion for the extraordinary course that the Senator suggests?

Mr. LODGE. In order to get a proper investigation.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does not the Senator think that the Senate committee can do that?

Mr. LODGE. Not if it is going to employ Mr. Heney.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator's objection, then, is to Mr. Heney?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; but there may be other Mr. Heneyes. I do not know.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator is unwilling to have the committee exercise its discretion in the selection of an attorney except upon the condition he has named?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I am, under the existing situation.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator knows that a very distinguished public man, Governor Pinchot, suggested the selection of Mr. Heney, and that Governor Pinchot is the governor of the State from which Mr. Mellon comes, or in which Mr. Mellon lives.

Mr. LODGE. I do not see that that has any bearing upon it. I object just as much to Governor Pinchot directing our committees as I do to the payment of their counsel by a single Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has no more objection to Governor Pinchot making a suggestion to the committee than to the President doing so, has he?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think anybody has suggested anyone to the committee except the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Couzens]. It is not usual for the Senate to select Government counsel. I have never seen it done here before; but we provided that we should select Government counsel to try the most important case involved in the resolution first presented by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Walsh].

I was entirely in accord with that. I think it was well that the Senate should take part in the selection of those counsel. I think it has reached the point in this committee where the assent of the Senate will be equally valuable to the proper conduct of the inquiry.

Mr. President, I want to say a single word—and I shall be very brief—in regard to the letter which was transmitted by the President, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury himself. I do not think, and I did not mean to suggest that I thought, that the President's message was confined at all to the matter of the appointment of Mr. Heney. That was but one detail. I thought that what the President was particularly aiming at was this attempt of the Senate to enter into general charge of the papers of an important unit of the Treasury Department without regard to the statute law, or to the practice of the Senate and of the Executive in relation to papers.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator be kind enough to yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield again to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LODGE. I will. I should like to get through, but I will yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator has any impatience about the matter, I will not press my questions at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator knows, of course, that the special committee had not requested that any papers in the Treasury Department be submitted to it to which the Secretary had raised the slightest objection. The Senator knows that; and that the only papers which the committee had requested that it be permitted to investigate are papers which the public are entitled to see under the law. In other words, the committee had not sought, either expressly or impliedly, to procure possession of any records, or to get the right to examine any records, which under the law are withheld from publicity.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows perfectly well that the Secretary of the Treasury waived all rights he had, or might have had, and all objections to the investigation of papers—

Mr. ROBINSON. If he did that, why should the President of the United States—

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator let me finish my sentence? I at least ought to have the floor for that.

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. He waived any objection that could be made to the production of all returns relating to any corporation in which he had any personal interest. Those were asked for by the committee, I think.

Mr. ROBINSON. Since he did make the waiver, how can the President complain that the committee has acted improperly? It was within the province of the Secretary to refuse the waiver, in which event the committee could not have seen the papers; but since he did waive the privacy, I can not comprehend how the President finds it a circumstance which justifies him in criticizing the course of the Senate and refers to it as a lawless procedure. It was for the Secretary himself to determine whether he would waive privacy respecting the tax returns, and prior to the time when he was requested to do so by the special committee of the Senate, he had on his own motion expressed a purpose to do so, and had requested that the Senate committee take the course which it subsequently took. When the Senate committee acted upon the suggestion of Mr. Mellon and proceeded to investigate his private tax returns and the tax returns of the companies in which he was interested, it did so at his suggestion and request, and there was not the slightest occasion, according to my humble opinion, for the President either to feel or express resentment toward the Senate for its course and characterize it as having promoted lawless government.

Mr. LODGE. There is only one Secretary of the Treasury who could be affected and who was asked, and he made the waiver. The President, I take it, is undertaking to protect the

great body of innocent people, who have no political value in an inquiry, from having all their private business dragged out in a committee investigation on the chance of finding something.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me—

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a moment, with the Senator's permission. The Senator from Massachusetts, of course, knows that it has been stated repeatedly in the Senate, and has never been questioned, that it was the purpose of the committee to hold confidential the information which it obtained, unless some consideration sounding in the public interest required publicity; so that there was not the slightest danger of any stockholder in a Mellon company being injured or prejudiced by the action of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows that when such things are discussed in a committee they get out.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I know he does not want to labor under a misapprehension—

Mr. LODGE. I am laboring under no misapprehension.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the Senator is—

Mr. LODGE. If I have misstated a fact, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. SWANSON. The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] stated—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I can save my time and the Senate's. I am not going to discuss the speech of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. SWANSON. I am not discussing his speech.

Mr. LODGE. It is not relevant, and I am not going to discuss it.

Mr. SWANSON. This is a statement of fact.

Mr. LODGE. I decline to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts declines to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to complete what I have to say about Mr. Mellon. I am not here to discuss the Senator from Indiana or his speech. He can do that himself, and do it very well.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the junior Senator from Virginia?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GLASS. I have no disposition in the world to interrupt the Senator or to divert him from his line of argument; but it just occurs to me to point out to him, if I may in a moment, that the President could very easily and quickly have met the precise situation by calling attention to the fact that under the law no tax return in the Treasury may be examined without the consent of the President himself. So that there was no possibility of the committee, in the circumstances, dragging out any private papers in the Treasury.

Mr. LODGE. It appeared to me from what I read of the proceedings of the committee that that was precisely what they were intending to do. That was the whole point of their investigation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LODGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I just wanted to ask the Senator if this language of the Secretary himself about it would not preclude further statement on the part of the President. Mr. Mellon said:

I feel, however, that it is due to me and to the companies involved that your committee make immediate investigation in order that you may thoroughly satisfy yourselves and the public whether or not these companies have received any favors at the hands of the Government.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury knew perfectly well that the whole investigation under that committee was directed against him, and, like an honest man, he proceeded to answer it at once. This whole investigation is aimed at Mr. Mellon, and I am about to say something in regard to him and his conduct of the department.

In my judgment he has been treated by that committee in a way which, if it had been applied to my friend the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Glass], who was an admirable Secretary of the Treasury, whose integrity was never questioned, who did the very best he could or that any man could do in a difficult situation—if he had been subjected to this, I think I know his temperament well enough to know that he would have resented it in language which everybody would have remembered.

This investigation is aimed at Mr. Mellon, not merely because he happens to be a Republican and the Secretary of the Treasury, but because he is the principal figure in the work of framing a great bill aimed to reduce the taxes of this country, a

bill in which the whole country is interested. Some of us believe in the bill as he framed it, many do not, and there are honest differences of opinion; but this investigation has assumed the position of an attempt to break him down, and there is much more behind it than mere politics, in my judgment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts certainly does not mean to imply that any comment which I have made was intended to break down any tax plan?

Mr. LODGE. I am absolutely certain there was no such intention. I listened to every word the Senator said. He made a very able speech, as I have already said, and I am perfectly certain that nothing of that sort was in his mind.

On account of the conduct of this committee, and because of the kind of questions that have been asked, Mr. Mellon naturally feels the irritation and resentment that an honest man should feel. Mr. Mellon has occupied this great post, and has been an admirable Secretary of the Treasury. The proof is in something much more significant than anything brought out by an investigating committee can possibly be.

When Mr. Mellon came into office, on the 4th of March, 1921, the Liberty 3½'s were selling for \$90.92.

Liberty first 4's	\$87.22
Liberty second 4's	87.00
Liberty first converted 4½'s	87.22
Liberty second converted 4½'s	87.04
Liberty third converted 4½'s	90.26
Liberty third converted 4½'s registered	90.12
Liberty fourth 4½'s	87.18

I will now read in the same order the prices at which they are selling to-day.

Liberty 3½'s are selling for \$99.03, an advance of 9 points. Liberty first 4's have gone from \$87.22 to \$99.25. Liberty second 4's have gone from \$87 to \$99.23. Liberty first 4½'s have gone from \$87.22 to \$99.27. Liberty third 4½'s have gone from \$90.26 to par and 0.04. Liberty third 4½'s have gone from \$90.12 to par and 0.02. Liberty fourth 4½'s have gone from \$87.18 to \$99.20.

Mr. President, I do not for a moment say that that great rise in the securities of the United States was owing solely to Mr. Mellon, but I do say, and it can not be contradicted, that there never would have been such a rise in our securities if the people had not trusted the man at the head of the Treasury, and had not known that his general policies were sound and wise, and that he was working for the interests of the finances of the United States.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. I not only agree with that statement, but I go further and say that had not the people of the United States trusted the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States the securities of the Nation would have gone even lower than the first quotation made by the Senator from Massachusetts. But does the Senator from Massachusetts think he is exactly fair in not further indicating that there has been a period of more than three years in which private investors in the country have had an opportunity to absorb those securities, and does not the Senator know that in that very process itself the securities were obliged to rise in value?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; I thought I had stated clearly that I did not attribute this all to Mr. Mellon. What I did say was that there would not have been that rise if he had been a Secretary of the Treasury in whom the country did not have confidence.

Mr. GLASS. Why, of course that is so.

Mr. LODGE. I was going to say another word in regard to that when the Senator interrupted me. I was on the committee which authorized these bond issues, and when we came to the later bond issues, of course we consulted with the Secretary of the Treasury—Mr. McAdoo at that time—as we did on all of them. As members of that committee who are here now remember, there was a question as to the rate. The Secretary of the Treasury believed that the bonds could be sold successfully at par, owing to the excitement and patriotism of the country, then greatly aroused. In that judgment events showed he was perfectly right. I thought at the time that he was right on that point, but I differed with him as to the rate, because I felt sure that after the excitement of war had subsided those securities were sure to reach a much lower market level, to the distress of small holders. It seemed to me at the time—perhaps I was wrong—that it would have been better to have made a higher rate and prevented the shrinkage which afterwards took place, for which the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, was in no wise responsible, nor was anyone else. It was simply the natural effect of cer-

tain economic forces, and the Senator from Virginia has just alluded to some of them.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask the Senator to yield for a question that is not intended to interfere with the Senator's argument, but intended possibly to throw a little light upon the advance in the price of the Federal securities.

When the refunding of the British debt was arranged for, I believe it was a part of the contract that the Federal Treasury should accept at par, when presented by the British Government, any American Government securities. They were at that time, I believe, selling quite a bit below par.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no. I will say to the Senator that those bonds were at par at the time the settlement was made. The Senator from Minnesota said they were greatly below par, but at that time, I think, the bonds were slightly higher than they are to-day.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I want also to call attention to the revenue act of 1921 which made Federal securities tax exempt when held by corporations. I believe Mr. Mellon stated in his letter to Mr. GREEN, which is made a part of his annual report for last year, that a tax-exempt security yielding 5 per cent was as good as a taxable security yielding 11 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Provided the income of the individual holding the tax-exempt security ran into the highest brackets of the income tax law.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes. I simply wanted to point out to the Senator the fact that on account of that provision of the revenue act of 1921 it has evidently had a great deal to do with the rise in price of Federal securities.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, Mr. President, the great rise had taken place long before that. If the Senator will look over the figures he will find that to be the fact. The rise began much before March 4, 1921.

The public debt on August 31, 1919, reached its peak, higher than it was in 1918, because there were a great many outstanding debts and obligations that had to be met. It went up to \$28,594,000,000. On February 28, 1921, it had come down to \$24,049,527,000. On March 31, 1924, it had come down to \$21,623,777,000, a reduction in the three years since Mr. Mellon has been in the Treasury of \$2,425,000,000 of the debt.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I would like to inquire the opinion of the Senator as to the advisability of such an enormous reduction in the public debt in the very short period of time to which the Senator refers. Would it not have been much better for the people of the country to have had their taxes lowered than to continue to pay such a high rate of taxation, but reduce the debt?

Mr. LODGE. That is a very large question of financial policy. I think the policy suggested by the Senator from New Mexico would be a mistake, but I do not care to discuss that large question of financial policy at this time.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator has, of course unwittingly, failed to state that there had been a reduction of more than \$1,500,000,000 in the public indebtedness between the years 1919 and 1921.

Mr. LODGE. I stated that. I did not give the figures, but I stated the fact. I have the figures here. I did not mean to overlook the figures.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator did not make the fact known and indicate just what was the reduction. But what I rose particularly to say was that the law itself provides a stated sinking fund, and had Mr. Mellon been dead and had the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts occupied the post of Secretary of the Treasury the same reduction of public indebtedness would have taken place.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; if there had been the same reductions made in other directions. Those were not the only reductions.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts again yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LODGE. Not at this moment. I want to reply first to the Senator from Virginia. I gave the public debt at the peak as \$26,000,000,000. I gave it as of February 28, 1921, the figures showing a reduction of about \$2,500,000,000. I

then gave the reduction in 1924, which was \$2,500,000,000 more. I omitted to state—and I ought to have stated—that in round numbers the total reduction since the peak of 1919 was about \$5,000,000,000, which had been taken from the indebtedness; and, of course, part of that was when the Senator from Virginia himself and, I think, Mr. Houston were at the head of the Treasury.

It is not necessary now, because I am not making a financial speech, to go into the sources of those reductions. They were not all from one source. The Senator knows that better than I do. Some were from reductions in expenses. Others were from great sales of Government property which had to be disposed of. In the period of time before the Republican administration came in on March 4, 1921, half of the great reduction of \$5,000,000,000 had been made. But the whole point is not to argue the merits of one financial policy or another, but simply to say, and I believe the Senator from West Virginia will agree with me in this—

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, that is the second time the Senator has mislocated me. I am from Virginia.

Mr. LODGE. I mean the junior Senator. That is a fact of which I ought to be well aware. I know of course who the senior Senator from Virginia is.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico and Mr. NEELY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. I should like to say that the Senator from West Virginia is very glad the Senator from Massachusetts complimented the distinguished Senator from Virginia by locating him in our State.

Mr. LODGE. I did not know I did as badly as that. I thought I made the mistake of not calling him the junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator now yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator has doubtless observed the total reduction of the debt of the United States last year was \$1,072,000,000. Does the Senator from Massachusetts believe that it was a wise policy to have continued the high tax rate of the people so as to reduce the debt by that amount?

Mr. LODGE. What does the Senator mean? To what debt does the Senator refer?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I refer to the debt of the United States, to which the Senator from Massachusetts has just been adverting. The debt was reduced last year.

Mr. LODGE. I think it was reduced by \$1,072,000,000.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; \$1,072,000,000. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he believes it is a wise policy to make such an enormous reduction in the permanent debt of the United States in one year?

Mr. LODGE. We are engaged in trying to reduce taxes in view of the surplus which has been attained.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does not the Senator believe it should have been done prior to this time?

Mr. LODGE. I believe in the very old-fashioned doctrine that there is no wealth in debts, and that the best way is to pay them as soon as it can be conveniently and safely done.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is anyone in the country who realized that the business of the country would increase as it did and enable us to collect the amount of money under the existing law that was collected. Senators will remember the amount that was given as the estimate of receipts during the year 1922. The amount collected has exceeded every estimate in every case, beginning with the amount estimated to be collected by the tariff down through every section of the revenue law. As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, we would have had a bill passed to reduce the taxes for the year 1923 to the extent of 25 per cent, but it failed of enactment before March 15. However, the Senator knows that such a provision is incorporated in the revenue bill that has just been reported to the Senate.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I would like to make this observation about what the Senator from Utah has just said.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be through in a very few moments, and then I will yield the floor to the Senator permanently.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have no desire to ask the Senator to yield the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have mentioned these facts simply to show that the administration of the Treasury Department by Mr. Mellon has been eminently wise and eminently successful. He feels that the character of the investigation now proposed to be carried on not only reflects on him, as it was intended to do when it was started, but that it is bringing about a situation which will be very deleterious to the transaction of public business in the Treasury, although he would be a better judge of that than I.

I can quite conceive, however, that the business of that great department would be most prejudicially affected, and thereby the business of the country would be injured if we unchained a criminal lawyer and turned him loose in that department with power to look into the affairs of rich and poor, guilty, if there be any guilty, and innocent alike. I can quite understand that men who are working in that great force of 60,000 employees will work less if they think they have a spy at their shoulders all the time. The great bulk of them are honest men, doing their duty honestly. I can quite see the President's point. Against that he makes a protest, and I am glad he has made the protest, for it involves not Mr. Mellon alone but, in my opinion, it involves the future of the tax bill and also a continuance of a sound administration of the Treasury.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. McKELLAR, and Mr. BRUCE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me in order that I may make a request for unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for the purpose he has stated.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next at 2 o'clock the unfinished business then before the Senate, if any, be temporarily laid aside, and that if in the meantime the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate shall not have reported upon the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] authorizing the special committee charged with the investigation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to employ counsel, experts, and accountants, the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that the Senate proceed to vote upon the resolution and all amendments which may be submitted to it.

Mr. BRUCE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me in order that I may state the reason for my objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Some of the rest of us would like to express our opinion in reference to the question which has just been under discussion. Indeed, there are some of us who think we should do so. I simply make this statement in order that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] may understand that I had a good reason for making the objection which I did.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me in order that I may make a statement with reference to what has just been stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee for the purpose he has indicated.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senate that, so far as two of the members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate are concerned, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and myself have made very active efforts to secure a meeting of the committee and to have the resolution referred to by the Senator from Arkansas—the Jones resolution—reported favorably, but the chairman of the committee has declined to call a meeting, or at least he has not done so, and wishes the matter postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House further insisted on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 47 to the bill (H. R. 5078) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the

two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CARTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had adopted a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) providing that the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, in signing the enrolled bill (H. R. 6815) to authorize a temporary increase of the Coast Guard for law enforcement, be rescinded and that the said bill be reenrolled with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 655) to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. KEYES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Walpole, N. H., praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Niagara-Shawnee Agriculture Club at Niagara, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called McNary-Haugen export corporation bill in its original form, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAPPER presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Molly Foster Berry Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Fort Scott, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson restrictive immigration bill, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FLETCHER presented petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Miami and vicinity, in the State of Florida, praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson restrictive immigration bill, with quotas based on the 1890 census, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Akron, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson immigration bill, with a 2 per cent restriction and quotas based on the 1890 census, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of James Grooves and sundry other citizens of Salem, of 450 members of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church, and of 400 members of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Columbus, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of restrictive immigration legislation, with quotas based on the 1890 census, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CAMERON. I present a letter from Charles S. Taylor, department adjutant-treasurer, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, of Tucson, Ariz., transmitting certain resolutions adopted at the recent convention of the Department of Arizona, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF ARIZONA,
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR,
Tucson, Ariz., April 10, 1924.

HON. RALPH CAMERON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg to inclose copies of resolutions Nos. 5, 7, and 16, passed and adopted by the Department of Arizona, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in convention assembled at Tucson, Ariz., April 1, 2, and 3, 1924.

I am especially asked to call your attention to resolution No. 5 and to request your careful consideration of the matters therein contained.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES S. TAYLOR,
Department Adjutant-Treasurer.

Resolution 5, requesting that the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 51, Tucson, Ariz., be made a permanent hospital, and that necessary improvements be authorized.

Whereas an official of the United States Veterans' Bureau has recommended that the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 51, Tucson, Ariz., be made a permanent hospital; and

Whereas the climate along the coast of the twelfth district is too damp for a certain class of tuberculosis patients, and the altitude at Whipple Barracks is too high for another class of tuberculosis patients; and

Whereas United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 51 is located at an altitude that is neither too high nor too low for any class of tuberculosis patients; and

Whereas this hospital is located in an ideal dry climate, especially favorable to the treatment of tuberculosis of all types; and

Whereas there is a special need for an institution of this class in the twelfth district, so that tubercular veterans needing this special care and treatment can obtain it under favorable conditions and proper supervision without being sent to far-distant hospitals, where they would be kept separated from their families and those who are near and dear to them; and

Whereas the present type of wooden shacks and buildings are hot in summer and cold in winter, poorly equipped, and otherwise unsuited to the proper care of tubercular veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Arizona, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in convention assembled, Request the United States Veterans' Bureau to take immediate steps to make the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 51 a permanent hospital, and have modern permanent buildings erected, and make other necessary improvements; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to each Congressman and Senator from the said twelfth district.

Passed and adopted at Tucson, Ariz., April 1, 1924.

Resolution 7, requesting amendment of war risk insurance act to include men who were disabled in service between April 6, 1917, and enactment of war risk insurance act, on November 6, 1917.

Whereas there are many men who were discharged from the service after April 6, 1917, on account of disabilities incurred in the service, who did not have an opportunity to apply for insurance under the war risk insurance act, which was passed at a later date; and

Whereas these men should be entitled to the same insurance benefits as other men who were disabled in the service of their country during the World War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Arizona Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in convention assembled at Tucson, Ariz., April 1, 2, and 3, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to amend the war risk insurance act so that any person who served in the active military service after April 6, 1917, and who was discharged from service because of disabilities incurred in the service prior to the enactment of the war risk insurance act on October 6, 1917, shall be deemed to have made legal application for, and shall be entitled to receive, all insurance benefits of the war risk insurance act as amended.

Passed and adopted at Tucson, Ariz., April 2, 1924.

Resolution 16, being a resolution concerning the retention of non-tuberculosis patients at United States Veterans' Hospital No. 51, at Tucson, Ariz.

Whereas the Veterans' Bureau has announced its intention to transfer all nontuberculosis patients from the United States Veterans' Hospital No. 51, at Tucson, Ariz.; and

Whereas a certain class of men who are suffering from bronchitis, asthma, and other respiratory diseases have found that the climate in this vicinity has proven very beneficial to them, and that they have failed to improve in other localities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Arizona, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in convention assembled at Tucson, Ariz., April 1, 2, and 3, 1924, go on record as opposing the transfer of nontuberculosis patients from United States Veterans' Hospital No. 51, at Tucson, Ariz., but that separate quarters and mess hall be provided for such nontuberculosis patients.

Passed and adopted April 3, 1924.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MAYFIELD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 354) for the relief of J. H. Toulouse (Rept. No. 408); and

A bill (S. 825) for the relief of Archibald L. Macnair (Rept. No. 409).

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) to authorize the American National Red Cross to continue the use of temporary buildings now erected on square No. 172, Washington, D. C., reported it without amendment.

Mr. DIAL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment:

A bill (H. R. 4200) to provide for the cleaning of the exterior of the post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio; and

A bill (H. R. 6059) authorizing the conveyance to the city of Washington, Mo., of 10 feet of the Federal building site in said city for the extension of the existing public alley through the entire block from Oak to Lafayette Streets.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3091) declaring an emergency in respect of certain agricultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 410) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 3104) for the relief of Elie Rivers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 3105) for the relief of Clara D. True; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 3106) to incorporate the American Psychological Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFLIN (by request):

A bill (S. 3107) to amend the United States cotton futures act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 3108) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Spencer, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRUCE:

A bill (S. 3109) for the relief of Frank H. Walker and Frank E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3110) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage service, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes," approved March 9, 1920; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WARREN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 114) authorizing an investigation of the proposed Casper-Alcova irrigation project, Natrona County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT TAX LAWS

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1786) to amend sections 5, 6, and 7 of the act of Congress making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, approved July 1, 1902, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO TAX REDUCTION BILL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the revenue bill and ask that it be printed in the Record and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HARRIS to the bill (H. R. 6715) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, viz: Insert as an additional section the following:

"Sec. —. That there shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in respect of the excess over the sum of \$1,000 which any person, family, firm, association, or corporation shall give, advance, pay, expend, subscribe, or contribute in the aggregate during any taxable year for the purpose, directly or indirectly, of influencing the nomination or defeat of any candidate or candidates for nomination, or the election or defeat of any candidate or candidates for office, or the success or defeat of any proposition, to be voted upon at any primary election or general or special election at which candidates for Members of the House of Representatives or for United States Senator or presidential electors are to be nominated or elected, a tax equal to 1,000 per cent of such excess; such expenditures or contributions to include all sums in any form contributed, subscribed, advanced, expended, paid or given to or for or against such candidate, candidates, or proposition or to or for party or other political committees or campaign funds, but not to include lawful expenditures made by such candidates or regular political committees or out of such campaign funds of moneys lawfully contributed to them.

"Every person, firm, and corporation required by law to make an income-tax return shall state therein specifically each item and the date thereof of all gifts, advances, expenditures, subscriptions, payments, and contributions made, and to whom, for the purpose of influencing the result of such primary and general elections and of all

taxes due thereon under the provisions of this section. And the treasurer or chairman of all State or congressional committees and of all political committees as defined in the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, entitled 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' and of all associations or committees organized to promote or prevent, or engaged in promoting or preventing, the nomination or election of any candidate for Member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate of the Congress of the United States or for presidential elector or electors, shall within 30 days after the election to be held therefor file with the collector for the district where the headquarters or other office where such committee or association is located a return stating specifically all sums of money received, from whom received, and the date thereof."

SENATOR BURTON K. WHEELER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that he has been advised by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] that in view of his duties upon the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Finance, it will be impossible for him to serve on the committee to which he was recently appointed relating to an examination of matters touching the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. The Chair appoints in the place of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

INCREASE OF COAST GUARD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House, which was read, as follows:

Concurrent Resolution 21

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President pro tempore of the Senate in signing the enrolled bill (H. R. 6815) entitled "An act to authorize a temporary increase of the Coast Guard for law enforcement," be rescinded and that in the reenrollment of the said bill the following amendment be made, viz: On page 2, line 44, after the word "enlisted," insert "warrant."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the word "warrant" was inserted as an amendment to the bill on the floor of the Senate, and was concurred in by the other House, but in enrolling the bill it was left out. The purpose of the passage of the concurrent resolution is to correct the enrollment. I, therefore, move that the Senate concur in the House resolution.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

BELIEF OF AGRICULTURAL DISTRESS IN NEW MEXICO

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRAZIER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. NORRIS, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS subsequently said: Mr. President, may I ask the Chair who were appointed conferees on the part of the Senate on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair was temporarily absent from the Chamber at the time the conferees were appointed, but he is informed the conferees appointed were the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask that I be relieved from serving on the conference committee, because it is a physical impossibility for me to give the attention to the matter which it will require. I ask that some other Senator may be appointed in my place?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Nebraska suggest the name of another conferee?

Mr. NORRIS. If the Chair desires to go down the list of names on the majority side of the committee, I suggest the next Senator on the list would be the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, the Chair appoints the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as a member of the conference committee in place of the Senator from Nebraska.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2576) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate for a short time on the pending bill looking to permanent restriction of immigration coming into the United States. Conditions change and necessarily the laws of our country must be changed in order to meet changing conditions. Up to the year 1880 we had no immigration policy in this country, and there was no need of one prior to that time. We had a great empire in the West which was unsettled and which needed the acquaintance of the plow and the advance of civilization. The immigration which was coming from Europe at that time came unassisted; it came to find homes; it paid its own way. There were homestead lands which were practically free to the settler who came to claim them. The result was that the restrictions on immigration then practically related merely to good character and to health. This condition in regard to our law remained until the act of 1913 was passed, adopting an educational test.

Mr. President, I think in considering the problems which are involved in the pending bill we should go back to the purpose and object of restrictive legislation. We did not adopt the original immigration law for the purpose of restricting certain classes of immigration coming from Europe, but the main purpose in passing legislation of any kind on the subject was to protect certain American standards. The real issue involved is the standard of American life and American living. On account of the great opportunities that were presented to the people of America in developing this wonderful continent, with its great natural resources in mine, forest, and field, the standard of American living had risen far above the average of any other country in the world. It is naturally the desire of our people to maintain that standard, and it should be the desire of the legislative body to keep that standard at least as high as it has been in the past, if it can not be made higher in the future.

Where that standard is most difficult to be maintained is in the field of labor. The fight in all the civilized world from the beginning of civilization has been at the bread line, where the human being fought for his daily bread. There it is that labor must come in contact with competition. If the standard of living at home has been built higher than it is accustomed to be maintained abroad, and then the lower standard is brought in contact with the standard at home, of necessity the lower standard has a tendency to draw the higher one down to its level. Therefore, the principal purpose for which legislation to restrict immigration into this country has been entered upon is to protect American labor in its efforts to maintain the high standard of wages and the proper standard of living which it has built up in the decades that lie behind us.

Restriction of immigration is primarily a question that addresses itself, first, to the American laborer and the ideals of American labor; and there we find the basis of our Republic. It is that great class of citizens who toil for their living; that great class of our people who must fight through their lives in order that they may have comfortable homes for their families and suitable education for their children, who determine the real standard and on whom the success of the American Republic depends. To those who are in comfortable circumstances, to those who do not have to toil for their daily bread, this issue does not present itself; and, on the other hand, although those in comfortable circumstances in this country do their part by the Government, often being the captains that direct the force of energy, yet the real position, both in peace and war of the American Republic, is determined by the standards of the American toiler. So, that I regard this bill establishing a permanent policy for the restriction of immigration as one of the great and vital legislative endeavors that has come before the Congress of the United States in my time.

I say "permanent" because we all recognize the fact that, although some years ago we passed a bill restricting immigration along this line, at the time of its passage a limitation was placed on the life of the bill and it was more or less regarded as a temporary expedient, but to-day the Congress is invited to enter upon a permanent policy to take its place in the future life of the Nation.

Unless labor may have a fair and a living wage, then the whole life of labor in this country must move backward; and the only field in which the wage of labor can be protected and determined, in the last analysis, is the field of competition.

You might adopt temporary expedients; you might by law attempt to shelter this employment or that; but in the end, in times of stress and disaster, no law could maintain an artificial standard. The standards of American labor must be

maintained and can only be maintained in the great field of competition; and that field of competition is determined by the man who applies for employment who is within the continental limits of the United States.

I recognize that there is something in the argument that is being made that we may bring on a degree of hardship in some of our factories and foundries or in the development of our agricultural land if there is a continued restriction of immigration; but I think and always have thought that it is far better for the onward progress of the Nation to move more slowly, to develop more surely, and carry the great ideals of American life and American living along with the Nation as it moves onward.

I have always regarded this as one of the most important questions that confronted our country. As far back as the year 1902 I offered in the House of Representatives an amendment to a pending immigration bill providing for an educational test for immigrants coming into this country. It was adopted by the House, and came to the Senate; but the Senate rejected the amendment, and it went out of the bill, and for 11 years it stood at the door of Congress inviting enactment. In 1913, my colleague from Alabama, a splendid man and a statesman whose memory may be revered, the Hon. John L. Burnett, of Alabama, reported an immigration bill containing the same clause. It was enacted into law, and is the law of the land to-day. It was intended to raise the standard of immigration coming into this country so that a higher standard of immigration would be presented on the fighting line where it came into competition with the American laborer.

I say this because I want it understood from what I am to say hereafter that I have always believed in restricting immigration and believe in it now.

I am in favor of the passage of this bill in its main features as it was reported to the Senate; but there is an issue presented to the Senate that will come before us for consideration before the final vote on this bill, and I have taken the floor to make clear my own position in regard to that matter.

A few years ago, when we passed the existing law restricting immigration to 3 per cent of the foreign population of this country, as shown by the census of 1910, we adopted the standard of 1910 because it was the latest census report that was available. There was no other purpose in its adoption. It was fixed as the basis of restricted immigration. Before the Great War immigrants were coming into this country from Europe at the rate of more than a million of people per annum. In some years, I think, it ran as high as a million and a half people. It was a serious pressure on American labor to maintain its standards and meet the inflow of so great an amount of immigration; but after the enactment of the present law the immigration coming into the United States was reduced to some 350,000 immigrants. In other words, the inflow of competition at the labor market was reduced to a fourth or a fifth of what existed prior to that time. The dangers and difficulties that confronted the people of the United States were in a large measure removed, and do not exist to-day, and will exist in a much less degree if the pending bill is enacted.

Under the pending bill, providing for the admission of 2 per cent based on the census of 1910, the immigration coming into this country will amount to about 238,000 immigrants, reducing by a third the immigration now admitted into the United States. The census of 1890 showed over 7,000,000 of foreign-born residents in this country from northern and western Europe, and only 800,000 from southern and eastern Europe; but when you come to the census of 1910, by reason of death or removal, the residents of this country under the census of 1910 from northern and western Europe amounted to only 6,500,000, and from southern Europe to 5,200,000. It is perfectly clear, then, to anybody who desires to consider the facts—in truth, it is admitted—that the purpose of changing the present standard of the law is to discriminate against immigration coming from southern and eastern Europe.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I should not like to have that statement pass unanswered. The purpose, I think, of most of us in changing the quota basis is to cease from discriminating against the native born here and against the group of our citizens who come from northern and western Europe. I think the present system discriminates in favor of southeastern countries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no doubt that the Senator from Pennsylvania understands his position clearly, but he does not make it clear to me.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. KING. I did not hear the Senator from Pennsylvania. Does the Senator, in that statement, assume to speak for the committee?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am speaking for myself and, I think, for many on the committee.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that in the committee we adopted the 1910 basis.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I did not make the statement for the committee.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] that I entirely concur with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. My idea, and I think the idea of a majority of the committee, was to discriminate in favor of the American people; and if it should fall heavily upon one of the other nations, that was not a material matter. We looked only to the interests of the American people.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My friend from Tennessee has interpreted the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania, so I now understand what he meant. In other words, the Senator thinks that it is in the interest of the American people to cut down the immigration that is coming from southern Europe and to increase the immigration from northern Europe. That is just what I said. I did not apply it in that way, but I never try to disguise my position by words. The purpose of this change is not to reduce immigration coming into this country that is going to force itself up against the bread line. It is not a question of protecting the standard of American labor and American life and the American home—no; it is not that, because that is determined by the brawn and sinew of each man's arm. It is numbers that count in the standard of daily work. In fact, if there were any discrimination, the higher the standard of those you admitted in efficiency and ability to work, the greater competition you would have at the dinner pail.

The purpose of this change in the bill is quite evident. It is not to protect American labor. It is to discriminate against one class of immigration in favor of another.

If we were going to build our country from foreign lands, if we were going to allow unlimited immigration to flow into this country from all sources, I can readily see how that question might be material. But when we are limiting immigration to a very narrow field, to the field as to which those most in favor of restriction feel that we have reached the limit, as expressed in this legislation, the question of assimilation is not the serious question it would be if we had unrestricted immigration.

Some may ask me why I take this position and voted the other day against the admission of Japanese into this country. In the first place, let me say that the question of immigrants coming into this country is entirely a domestic issue. It has always been recognized as a domestic issue. It was proclaimed as a domestic issue when the treaty of peace was signed at Versailles and was recognized as a domestic issue at the Washington conference. It has been recognized by all countries in the world that each and every nation for itself must determine whom it will admit to its shores to come in contact with its own people.

More than that, if the situation were reversed the Empire of Japan would take exactly the position we are proposing to take in this bill. Why do I say that? Because when Japan was threatened with unlimited immigration coming from China she herself restricted Chinese immigration coming into Japan to the business classes and the merchant classes, and removed Chinese immigration from competition with the labor of Japan. I do not say this in any way to reflect on the Japanese people. They are a great people. They are an ancient people. They have proved their standing among the nations of the earth at the sword's point. The whole world recognizes that they are great warriors, and they have demonstrated their ability within little more than half a century to adopt the methods and the genius of western civilization and make them their own. It is not because we wish to reflect on them or because we discriminate against them that we have included in this bill a restriction against Japanese immigration coming to this country, but it is because of racial integrity.

There never was a race in the world that did not desire to maintain its own racial integrity. The Zulu chief in Africa resents the foreigner. The American Indian welcomed to his shore Columbus's sailors until they wanted to dominate the land and carry back the Indian women of America. Then they turned and massacred those whom Columbus had left in the port in the West Indies on his first trip.

Racial integrity will be maintained always by every race of people, and we can not permit the yellow and the brown races to come to this country in large numbers without destroying racial integrity. More than that, we have recognized that fact in our law, and have refused to grant citizenship to immigrants of either the yellow or the brown race.

No man should be admitted as an immigrant to this country unless the law itself expects at some time that he may become an American citizen and take part in the affairs of our Government, so there is a reason for the exclusion of those from the Asiatic shores without in any way reflecting on them that makes it entirely different from European immigration.

The great body of European immigration comes from the same source. Their blood has been mixed through the centuries. There may be a division in language. There may be some dissimilar racial characteristics. But they belong to the white blood, to the Caucasian race, and it is more opportunity that has made the division than it is racial characteristics.

As I said a moment ago, it is idle to say that this change is made on the basis of protecting the American standards and American labor, because under this bill as it stands we are going to allow to enter this country only 238,000 immigrants a year, and, if the change is made adopting the census of 1890, we will allow 169,000 immigrants to come in, making a change of competition at the bread line of only 69,000 human beings, half of whom at least will be not wage earners, but those who will be dependent on others. So that the number is insignificant as compared with the great flood of immigration that beat upon our shores but a few years ago.

More than that, if that were all that was involved, if it were only a question of the numbers that should be admitted, without reflecting on anybody, the basis could be reduced from 2 per cent to 1½ per cent figured on the census of 1910, and there would be fewer immigrants coming into this country than would come in under the 2 per cent provision with the census of 1890 as the basis.

So it is perfectly apparent that the purpose of the change in this bill is not to protect the standards of American labor, and not to protect the standards of American life and American ideals, but it is to discriminate against one class of European immigrants coming into our country as in favor of another.

Mr. President, if we will look at the census returns, and compare the number of immigrants who come in from these countries, we will find that from northern Europe, under the census of 1910, as compared with that of 1890, there is an increase from Austria, which is a German country, of 3,704; of 333 from Belgium; of 764 from Norway; of 596 from Estonia; of 2,269 from Finland; of 567 from the Netherlands; of 1,481 from Denmark; of 4,601 from Sweden; and of 221 from Switzerland, making a total increase from those countries of 14,536. There would be an increase of those coming from Czechoslovakia of 7,499; from Yugoslavia, 3,349; from Poland, 11,580; from Russia, 14,278; and from Italy, 23,949, making a total of 60,655.

There are some smaller countries involved on both sides of this equation where the difference in change would be less than 100 to each country, and I shall not worry the Senate by going into all the minute details; but the fact is that if we adopt the census of 1910 as the basis as against the proposed amendment making the census of 1890 the basis, we will get 60,000 additional immigrants from Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Russia, and Italy. That is the issue.

I do not know how far Senators who are going to vote on this bill have analyzed conditions in those countries, but there is no portion of Europe where there is a finer industrial development, a worthier civilization, a straining after higher ideals and the best in government, in social life, and in industrial and agricultural development than will be found in Czechoslovakia. But we want to change the standard so that we will eliminate 7,499 from that country. Those who are coming from Yugoslavia are comparatively few in the estimates.

To Poland we close the doors, and yet if I remember rightly on one of the great squares in this Capital City, facing the White House, within my time of service in one of the branches of the Congress, we have erected a statue to the heroism of a great Pole who came here during the Revolutionary War and drew his sword and offered his life to sustain the independence of the American Government. They are white. They belong to the race of northern Europe. They have established a republic of their own; and although in the late war a large portion of Poland was under the control of Germany, the heart-beats of the entire people were with our cause and with our soldiers.

Russia? What is the difference between the Prussian, whom you desire to admit, and the Russian across the border? They

come from the blood of northern Europe. They are both Slavic in their original ancestry. The difference is that one has had the advantage of a development of civilization to a longer extent than the other. But in Russia we find a great white race, a pure white race, a race that belongs to what we in later years call the Nordic tribes. It has produced great soldiers, for we must not forget that on the battle lines in the early years of the Great War, before England was ready to go to the relief of France, before we were involved, this same Russian peasant, whom you now desire to condemn and write against his race the bar sinister, held the line for civilization. Between 1914 and 1916 if the Russian line had broken the German Empire would have succeeded and have been the dominant power of the world to-day. Yet by your action to-day you are writing the bar sinister against this race of people who held the line of civilization for you and for me.

Then the other race are the people of Italy, 23,000. They are not excluded because they are fighting the bread line. You could exclude them at the bread line without reflecting on their racial characteristics or their standard among nations. If that is all you desire, reduce your percentage from 2 to 1½ per cent and you will get less people than you would have by adopting the standard of 1890.

What are the Italians? You object to some of them because you do not think they are up to the standard that you want. The Lombards of Italy are as much Nordic in their type as your own race. They have been great warriors in their time and are to-day. All the arts of civilization have been bred and grown in their midst, sculpture, painting, and the other arts, literature, all the modern sciences. But a few, you say, do not come up to your standard. Why, Senators, if we are to be judged by the minority there are places in continental United States that will not measure up to the standards of European life. If you want to pick a spot on the universe to judge of the whole, look at your own country. Reverse the situation. If we are to be judged of by the minority, 10 per cent of the population of continental United States is black. Europe would not accept that as a standard under which to allow American immigration to go into Europe. But are we to be judged as a Nation because our standard does not ring true all along the line? No! Are you to judge of a nation itself that you are weighing and measuring in the balance because forsooth some small portion of that nation does not measure up to the ideal standard which you desire?

No, Mr. President; I say that this change is a mistake. There is nothing to be accomplished by it that will aid in the maintaining of the high standard of American labor and American life that we all desire to accomplish. They are only endangered at the line of competition, the bread line. But when you say to a very large portion of the people of the United States, citizens of this country, men and women who have the right to vote and sit in the councils of your Nation, "We draw this line against you and yours because we believe that you are unworthy of the high standard of American life and living," you are doing an act of injustice to those people, an act to which I shall not commit myself by my vote.

More than that, why should we forget that the same Italian people were in the three-power pact when the Great War broke out? They refused to invade France. They refused to tear down the last protecting wall which would save the political life of France. Then, in the end, they joined our allies. Their boys with your boys battled together in the Great War. The boys of their race who had adopted America as their home stood on the battle line with your sons and with mine. One great division from the State of New York was largely made up of the sons of these people, and when the killing days in the Argonne came they held the line. They held it for you and for me. And yet you are prepared to write the bar sinister against their names and say that they are unworthy of mixing with your blood. That is what you mean, and that is what the proposed amendment means.

Mr. President, I have been for restricted immigration and have said so on the floors of the Congress for more than 25 years. It is no new thing to me. As I said, I myself proposed the first educational test to protect American labor and American standards. But when you ask me to go to the point where I must discriminate against and bar the men who stood in the battle line with my son and fought the fight with him I decline to go with you. It is not American, it is not democratic to do it.

The great genius of this Republic was due to the fact that America opened its gates on the rock-bound coast of New England to provide a harbor of refuge for the Pilgrim Fathers who were driven from old England by persecution. Then but a few years later the scene changed, and within a

hundred miles of the Capital of the United States the Catholics of England found refuge on the shores of Maryland from persecution. Then the sons of New England and Maryland met and wrote the Constitution of the United States, which is the guaranty of our liberty, the protection of our homes, and the standard of our Republic and our lives.

The question of proscription is nothing new. It was here at the birth of the Democratic Party. It was out of this idea of intolerance that, under John Adams, the alien and sedition laws were written in the history of this country. The greatest Democrat who ever lived, standing for human rights, human liberty, and freedom of conscience, carried the issue to the country, and Thomas Jefferson became the President of the United States.

Under his administration the alien and sedition laws were removed from the statute books of the country. Yet the spirit of intolerance came down through the decades, and again showed itself in the fifties, when a party calling itself the American Party of the United States and known in history as the Know Nothing Party proclaimed the same idea of racial and religious intolerance.

I am glad to say that the party of which I am a member, the party in whose principles I hold faith, has always met this issue squarely and stood for human rights and human liberty. I wish to read into the Record of the Senate how that party proclaimed itself when it met in convention for the campaign of 1856. Section 10 of that Democratic platform reads as follows:

That the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith, and every attempt to abridge the privilege of becoming citizens and the owners of soil among us ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute books; and

Whereas, since the foregoing declaration was uniformly adopted by our predecessors in national conventions an adverse political and religious test has been secretly organized by a party claiming to be exclusively American, it is proper that the American Democracy should clearly define its relation thereto and declare its determined opposition to all secret political societies, by whatever name they may be called:

Resolved, That the foundation of this Union of States having been laid in and its prosperity, expansion, and preeminent example in free government built upon entire freedom in matters of religious concernment and no respect of person in regard to rank or place of birth, no party can justly be deemed national, constitutional, or in accordance with American principles which bases its exclusive organization upon religious opinions and accidental birthplace. And hence a political crusade in the nineteenth century and in the United States of America against Catholic and foreign born is neither justified by the past history or the future prospects of the country nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government.

Mr. President, I do not make that declaration; other Senators do not make that declaration; but, as that platform states, from the day of Jefferson down to the adoption of this clause in the platform of 1856 it was the principle, the great and enduring principle, of the Democratic Party.

The party of Thomas Jefferson has lived for human rights; it has lived for human freedom; it has always stood for freedom of religious worship, and if the hour has come when the democracy of America can no longer ring true to the fundamental principles of this great party, then the seed of discord and corruption has already entered its soul and its destiny is ended.

What did Thomas Jefferson leave behind him to write his name among the foremost of our great Republic? It was not that he had been a great President of the United States; it was not that he had been ambassador to France in the hour of danger and difficulty facing the young American Republic; and it was not that he had been Governor of the great State of Virginia. No; when he came to die he wrote his own epitaph and he ordered written on his tombstone at Monticello—

Here lies the body of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, of the statute of religious freedom in Virginia, and father of the University of Virginia.

Three great achievements, all standing for human rights and human liberty, for freedom of men; and yet we have reached a time when the great party to which I hold allegiance, the party of Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, the party of Mason, who wrote the Bill of Rights, the party of Madison, the father of the Constitution, is preparing to reverse the principle that it declared in its platform of 1856—

and that is the foundation stone of the party to which we give allegiance—and exclude immigrants from this country, not because they endanger American civilization, not because they endanger labor at the bread line, but, forsooth, because we have become so nice that we do not wish to associate with people coming from particular foreign countries. In other words, instead of standing for the great principles of human rights and human liberty, and freedom of conscience, we are going to tear down our standard and yield our cause to passion and to prejudice. On that ground I will not follow.

There is no discrimination in the present law; there is no reason for its change; there is no danger to American ideals in the bill reported by the Senate Committee, but if the change shall be made it will be made for the purpose directly, and for no other purpose, of discriminating against one class of people in favor of another, on grounds that are not democratic and not American.

Mr. SHIELDS obtained the floor.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHIELDS. I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yesterday afternoon the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] both inquired of me whether there was going to be any record vote during the remainder of the day as far as I could tell, and I assured them that there would not be. In giving that assurance I meant to say that no yeas-and-nays vote would be called for on any proposition so far as I could see. They very naturally interpreted what I said as meaning that there would be no vote on any subject. As a matter of fact, the Senate did vote without yeas and nays on the Japanese-exclusion section which I offered, and I have unmeaningly done them an injustice in leading them to think there would not be any vote. For that reason, Mr. President, and at the request of both of those Senators, I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of that vote and an immediate yeas-and-nays vote on the question, so that they may enter their dissent to the adoption of the section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRAZIER in the chair). Is there any objection?

Mr. SHIELDS. Does the Senator want an immediate vote?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the Senator will yield for that purpose; otherwise, I can not presume on his courtesy.

Mr. SHIELDS. If I do not yield the floor, and if that is an accommodation to the Senator, I will do so.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, may I ask what the Senator's request was? I have just come into the Chamber.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have just explained that unwittingly I did an injustice to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], both of whom wanted to vote against the Japanese-exclusion section. I assured them there would be no record vote, meaning no yeas-and-nays vote; but a viva voce vote was taken, and they were not here because of my assurance. I am now asking that without discussion, and without its resulting in the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] losing the floor, the Senate shall now take a yeas-and-nays vote on the adoption of that section.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, if I do not yield the floor, and there is no discussion, I will yield for the accommodation of the Senator.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have no objection; but as the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and there will be another opportunity for a vote when the bill goes into the Senate, I should like to ask the Senator why we should call the roll now?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I suggested that, but the Senators who are concerned felt that they would like to register their protest promptly, and that is the reason for the unusual request which I make of the Senate.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to say just this word: I thought I had left word yesterday that I should be notified in case that amendment came up before the Senate; but I think the parties with whom I left the word overlooked the matter, and I was not notified, or I would have been here, of course, at the time.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I did not hear the Chair's statement in regard to my agreement to yield the floor only for this vote on condition that I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Tennessee. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none. The vote whereby the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered, and, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the yeas and nays are ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. There seems to be a misapprehension as to what is the pending question. Is it not upon the adoption of the exclusion amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the question.

The READING CLERK. On page 15, after line 17, the Senate on yesterday inserted the following amendment:

(c) No alien ineligible to citizenship shall be admitted to the United States unless such alien (1) is admissible as a nonimmigrant under the provisions of section 3; or (2) unless such alien is an immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the time of his application for admission to the United States has been, and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of, carrying on the vocation of minister of any religious denomination, or professor of a college, academy, seminary, or university; or (3) unless such alien is an immigrant who is a bona fide student over 18 years of age and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of study at an accredited school, college, academy, seminary, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Secretary of Labor; or (4) unless such alien is the wife or the unmarried child under 18 years of age of an immigrant admissible under subdivision (2) of this paragraph and is accompanying or following to join him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the calling of the roll.

The reading clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. WILLIS (when Mr. FESS's name was called). My colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], is unavoidably absent. If he were present, I am advised that he would vote for the pending amendment.

Mr. McCORMICK (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], which I transfer to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ERNST. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], but I understand that he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. My colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of California] is absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], with whom I am paired, is absent from the Chamber. I have already voted, but I understand that the Senator from Maine would vote as I have voted, and I therefore permit my vote to stand.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is absent owing to illness in his family. If present, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

I wish also to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—71

Adams	Ernst	Ladd	Robinson
Bayard	Fletcher	Lodge	Sheppard
Borah	Frazier	McCormick	Shields
Brandeggee	George	McKellar	Shipstead
Brookhart	Gerry	McKinley	Shortridge
Broussard	Glass	McNary	Simmons
Bruce	Gooding	Mayfield	Smith
Bursum	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Cameron	Harrell	Neely	Spencer
Capper	Harris	Norbeck	Stephens
Caraway	Harrison	Norris	Swanson
Copeland	Heflin	Oddie	Trammell
Curtis	Howell	Overman	Underwood
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	Wadsworth
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Wheeler
Edge	Kendrick	Ralston	Willis
Elkins	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	

NAYS—4

Colt	McLean	Sterling	Warren
Ashurst	Ferris	Lenroot	Walsh, Mass.
Ball	Fess	Owen	Watson
Couzens	Greene	Ransdell	Weller
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Reed, Mo.	
Edwards	King	Stanford	
Fernald	La Follette	Stanley	

So the amendment of Mr. REED of Pennsylvania was agreed to.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, the future immigration policy of the United States is challenging the most serious attention of the American people. They demand that this policy be changed from one of practically the open door to all peoples of the world to one of rigid restriction if not absolute prohibition of immigration. This is a matter of the greatest importance and must have prompt and favorable consideration. The immigrants we are receiving to-day are of a different character from those that came in the early history of our country, and the great numbers in which they are arriving is a cause of serious alarm and menaces the purity of the blood, the homogeneity, and the supremacy of the American people and the integrity and perpetuity of our representative form of government.

The highest duty of every nation is to protect its nationals and its government. Our constitutional form of government is recognized to be the wisest that was ever constructed and put into successful operation. We have boundless natural resources, surpassing those of all other countries in variety and value. But it is the sturdy and indomitable people who populated this country and founded our Government, developed these vast resources, who have made this the greatest, richest, and most powerful Nation in the world. If we permit the great American type of citizenship to be diluted, mongrelized, and destroyed, our civilization and free institutions will not survive. No mongrel race has ever achieved greatness in peace or war.

The people of the United States recognize in these great hordes of new immigrants a foreign invasion fraught with consequences as disastrous and humiliating as those of a military invasion. They are as much opposed to a peaceful conquest through the migrations of millions of undesirable alien immigrants as a conquest by an army with force and arms.

Mr. President, the apprehensions of the people are well founded, and conditions call for prompt and vigorous action. We must have a new and permanent policy which will prohibit further migrations of alien peoples and preserve the purity and integrity of American citizenship and republican institutions.

CONDITIONS REQUIRING LEGISLATION

I will briefly review the facts that have produced these alarming conditions and call for this legislation.

There have been great migrations of peoples from one country to another in all ages, and many of them have submerged and supplanted the peoples inhabiting the countries to which they migrated and overthrown their governments.

The migrations to the United States in recent years have broken all precedents. Where hundreds of thousands migrated to other countries, millions have come to America. Since 1820, 35,000,000 aliens have migrated to the United States. The great majority of them have come since 1880, 10,000,000 during the last 15 years. Comparatively few came before 1880, the wonderful increase of our population up to that time being almost entirely from colonial stock. These migrations gradually increased from 1880 to 1914. From 1902 to 1914 over 750,000 came annually, and during five of these years more than 1,000,000 came each year, 1,218,480 arriving in 1914.

The census of 1920 shows that we have a total white population of 94,820,915, of which number 58,421,956 are of native-born parentage, and that 36,228,958 are foreign born or of foreign-born parentage—13,712,754 foreign born, 15,694,539 of parents born abroad and 6,991,665 of mixed parentage—that is one parent born abroad and the other native; and that only about one-half of the foreign born are naturalized American citizens.

This census further shows that of the population of our cities there are 24,556,729 born of native parents, and 26,063,355 of foreign birth or foreign stock, and of these 10,386,963 are foreign born. The city of New York, with a population of 5,690,000 has 4,200,000 of foreign stock, of which 1,900,000 are alien by birth. Chicago out of a total population of 2,700,000 has 1,940,000, or 75 per cent, foreign stock. There are other cities where the majority of the population are foreign born or of foreign stock.

New England has almost changed its original stock of people; over 60 per cent of the population consists of those of foreign birth or whose parentage is foreign wholly or in part. Rhode Island leads all the States with a foreign stock of 69 per cent, followed by Massachusetts, with 66 per cent; Connecticut and North Dakota, with 65 per cent; Minnesota, 64 per cent; New York, 62 per cent; Wisconsin, 59 per cent; and New Jersey, 58 per cent. The total foreign stock for the Southern States, including Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas, is only 8 per cent as against 40 per cent in the rest of the country.

There are more than two-fifths of our white population foreign born and of foreign or mixed foreign parentage of the present generation. Without reference to the character of

the individual immigrants, this is ample cause for alarm and serious apprehension for the safety and supremacy of the American stock, who built our free institutions and are responsible for their maintenance.

These conditions have never existed or been approached in the history of our Government, and they fully justify the interest of all patriotic Americans in restricting immigration.

THE OLD IMMIGRANTS

Mr. President, the thirteen original States were British colonies, settled by immigrants from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and northern and western Europe—France, Holland, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, less than 10 per cent coming from the latter countries. These peoples were originally of the same common origin and stock, having much the same love of liberty and freedom and principles of Government, and comparatively easily assimilated.

The colonists from Great Britain and Ireland brought with them the customs, the language, ideals, aspirations, and the laws of that great Anglo-Saxon nation and established a Government which secured for them the inalienable rights of personal liberty, private property, security of the home, freedom of religious belief, free speech and press, trial by jury, and other rights of a free and sovereign people. The Nation which they created here is of the great Anglo-Saxon family, with the fixed principles and ideals which these people have carried with them and upheld in every part of the world they have settled and controlled.

The immigrants who came here from 1787 to 1880 were of the same stock, in about the same proportions, as those who founded our Nation and our Government, those coming from continental Europe increasing about 25 per cent in the last 20 years of that period. They came here for the purpose of acquiring homes, enjoying our free institutions, and becoming loyal American citizens. They brought their families with them and distributed themselves all over the country and were assimilated and merged into one homogeneous people with one language and attached to the same laws and the same principles and form of government. They assisted in subduing the forests, clearing the lands, and building our great cities and developing our great natural resources.

THE NEW IMMIGRANTS

Mr. President, the character and nationality of immigrants have changed since 1880. Immigration for some years has been almost entirely from southern and eastern Europe and Asia, countries whose nationals are racially different from the old immigrants. The total number of immigrants to the United States from northern and western Europe between 1871 and 1880 was about 2,700,000 and the total from southern and eastern Europe only 181,000, but between 1901 and 1910 the total of the former was 2,000,000 and those from southern and eastern Europe increased to 6,128,000. While previous to 1900 immigration from southern and eastern Europe constituted only 9 per cent of the European immigration, since then it has increased to 75 per cent of the total. More than three-fourths of the immigrants during the last 10 years came from Italy, Greece, Hungary, Poland, the Balkans, Russia, and some from Asia.

We have many splendid men and women, loyal and patriotic citizens, from all these countries who came to make America their home and to become Americans. We respect and honor them and are glad to have them. They are entitled to equal opportunities and equal rights with those who came before them. There should be no discrimination against them. They are all now Americans and many of them are successful business men and able and distinguished citizens, holding high positions and offices of trust, honor, and power. What I am now going to say does not apply to this class of immigrants.

The great majority of the present-day immigrants do not, like the old ones, distribute themselves over the States, mingle with and become absorbed in the great body of American people, and build homes, cultivate lands, or, in other words, become permanent and loyal American citizens. They do not have the social characteristics of the original stock. They are not assimilable and do not seem to desire to be assimilated. They bring with them lower standards of living and labor conditions and strange customs and ideals of social justice and government. Civil and religious liberty do not attract them, but they come here to enjoy our prosperity and possess the country our forefathers redeemed from the wilderness and improved as none other in the world.

They largely congregate in cities and form communities of their several foreign nationalities; they speak their own languages and train their children to do so. They continue to

cherish their former traditions, social aspirations, customs, and ideals of government, and more than half of them remain un-naturalized and owe allegiance to foreign governments. There are more than 3,000,000 of them who can not read or write English and perhaps 2,000,000 who can not speak our language. The city of Monessen, Pa., has a population of 21,000, only 3,000 of whom can speak the English language. There are whole wards in New York and Chicago where the English language is seldom heard and no newspapers printed in it read. These conditions are the natural consequence when a large number of immigrants come from one country.

The investigation of the great strike of the employees of the United States Steel Corporation developed the fact that more than one-half of the strikers were foreigners, representing 21 nationalities and speaking as many different languages.

Thirty-five per cent of those immigrants are illiterate and densely ignorant, and many of them are physically, mentally, and morally unsound. Secretary Davis recently stated that 20 per cent of the inmates of the insane asylums of our country are men and women of foreign birth. A large number of them are of the lawless class and undesirable citizens in every respect. It is well known that the governments of the countries from which these people come encourage and stimulate this class of immigration and keep at home the best of their nationals.

Mr. Secretary Davis, after a careful investigation, classified the present-day immigrants as follows:

Very superior	153,138
Superior	403,700
High average	1,016,211
Average	3,702,904
Low average	2,296,914
Inferior	4,276,573
Very inferior	2,080,262

We have received over 3,000,000 immigrants in 30 years below normal mentality, and their progeny have added to the number of degenerates, criminals, and inmates of insane asylums, burdening our country with obligations which have more than offset the real value of the desirable immigrants.

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

Mr. President, these undesirable immigrants are seriously endangering the peace and tranquillity of our people and the supremacy of our laws and Government. There are many of them who begin to plan to destroy our institutions as soon as they arrive in this country. They are not content with the American principle of equal opportunity, but demand equal conditions without deserving them. There are many who are intolerant of all restraint and all law and would introduce into this country the wildest doctrines of Bolshevism. We get the majority of the communists, the I. W. W.'s, the dynamiters, and assassins of public officers from the ranks of the present-day immigrant.

Communism has become a menace to our Government. There are many organizations, under different names, which are constantly plotting to overthrow our Government by force and violence when conditions offer favorable opportunity for such action. They have made insidious efforts to obtain control of organized labor; but, while it is said they have made converts in some of the unions, Mr. Gompers and other labor leaders, with commendable patriotism, have met and thwarted their efforts. They denounce all interests and all organizations not in accord with their views, and only recently in a meeting in Chicago the American Legion was denounced as an auxiliary of capital and all workers were ordered to withdraw from its membership. The strength and activities of the communists are found in the eastern and northern cities, where are the great body of undesirable immigrants. We have very few of them in the South, where the immigrants are of the better class, and are making good citizens; but this is a national problem, and I am discussing it from a national standpoint.

Mr. President, there are to-day more than a thousand daily, weekly, and monthly publications, in 42 different languages, printed in the United States which openly and defiantly advocate the overthrow of our Government. In addition to these, socialistic and anarchistic papers, advocating violence and bloodshed, published in Europe in foreign languages, are distributed in our country. Meetings are held in all centers of the foreign population in our cities and speeches made in foreign languages urging bloody revolution and ultimate confiscation and destruction of all private property.

The Communist, the official organ of the Communist Party, which is printed in a half dozen foreign languages, advocates organized revolution in the United States. Addressing the working men and women, it declared in so many words:

You must organize the shops and use the strike against the Government; you must be prepared so that when the revolutionary crisis comes you can turn a general strike against the Government into an armed uprising to overthrow all government.

There are said to be 2,000,000 radical communists in the United States. These people made necessary the espionage laws of the war, which unexplained, are a reflection upon the patriotism of the country.

Present conditions in Europe tend to increase immigration to this country of the idle, thriftless, and criminal classes. It is estimated that but for the restrictive legislation enacted in 1921, no less than 2,000,000 of these undesirable classes would have come to our shores from southern and eastern Europe during the last year.

If we allow this to continue, the character and distinguishing qualities of our nationals will be changed, and physical, mental, and moral degeneracy of the American people will inevitably follow, and our Government will be altered in conformity with their socialistic views and ideals.

NEW IMMIGRATION POLICY REQUIRED

Mr. President, the great migrations of the nationals of foreign countries must stop. We must adopt a fixed and firm policy, not apologetic, but militant and aggressive for that purpose. We must declare to the nations of the world now and for all time in no uncertain terms that we will not longer allow great migrations of people from any country to our shores. America has too long been made the dumping ground for their undesirable populations. As a sovereign nation it is our solemn duty to foster and protect the purity of blood, the characteristics, and ideals of the American people. The harmony and unity of our nationals must be preserved. We will do this without consulting the convenience and interest of any other government. Their officious interferences and protests against this bill are an insult to our sovereignty and should be resented by all Americans.

We do not need immigration. We are a world power and can safely depend and rely upon our own people for prosperity and defense of our country. The immigrants of to-day come to share our prosperity and not to contribute to it. The natural increase of our nationals will enable us to keep up with the populations of other countries. We do not want a densely populated country with the attendant evils found in such countries in Europe and Asia. Overpopulation destroys individualism and independence and weakens the physical and mental development of the people. Great Britain, France, Germany, nor any other civilized country permits hordes of immigrants from foreign countries.

IMMIGRATION A DOMESTIC POLICY

Mr. President, the problem which confronts us is not international. Immigration is a domestic problem solely within the control of each sovereign State. This question was fully discussed when the Senate had under consideration the approval of the covenant of the League of Nations contained in the Versailles Treaty. One of the most important reservations reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations was that declaring immigration to be a domestic question and reserving to the United States the absolute control of immigration to our country.

I consider the possible interference of foreign governments in our immigration policies to be one of the gravest consequences which would follow our becoming a member of the League of Nations. The protests that Italy, Rumania, Japan, and other countries are making against this legislation confirms this apprehension.

Our immigration policy must be determined by the American people, and the laws for its enforcement written by Americans and for America. The welfare of the Nation must control. Temporary economic, industrial, and commercial interests must give way to the safety of our people and our institutions. Contractors for cheap labor and foreign steamship companies reaping great profits from transporting immigrants, must not be allowed to further influence our immigration laws.

AMERICA HAS AIDED EUROPE

Mr. President, the argument that the policy and laws proposed are harsh and unjust to the people of Europe is without foundation in fact, humanity, or justice. We are under no legal or moral obligations to receive and provide for them. America has done more for Europe than Europe has done for herself. We have been taking care of their surplus population, good and bad, to the prejudice of our people and our institutions for the last 40 years. We lent them more than \$10,000,000,000 during the last war, which most of them show no disposition to repay.

Since the war we have given them nearly \$1,000,000,000 in charity and have no evidence of their gratitude. Their constant demands upon us are for more favors and for more money.

Notwithstanding these facts, we have among us men and women who are constantly insisting that we must "do something for Europe." Just what they mean, they do not say and I do not know, unless it is to contribute more of the earnings and savings of the American people to support the peoples of those countries while they are devoting themselves to their racial, commercial, and territorial prejudices and struggles. There are some who are insisting that we release their indebtedness to us, in order, as they say, to encourage them in their economic and industrial pursuits. They do not seem to have any consideration for the interest of the American people, who need that money to pay the Liberty loan bonds sold to raise it.

POLICY OF WASHINGTON

I believe in the policies of Washington and Jefferson: "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none," and which were eloquently approved by President Woodrow Wilson in his speech made in Washington, on May 6, 1914, when he said: "There are just as vital things stirring now that concern the existence of the Nation as were stirring then;" to wit, in Washington's time, and every man who worthily stands in this presence should examine himself and see whether he has the full conception of what it means. America should live her own life.

Washington saw it when he wrote his farewell address. It was not merely because of passing and transitory circumstances that Washington said we must keep from entangling alliances. It was because he saw that no country has yet set its face in the same direction in which America had set her face. We can not form alliances with those who are not going our way, and in our might and in confidence and definiteness of our own purpose we need not and we should not form alliances with any nation in the world. Those who are right, those who study their consciences in determining their policy, those who hold their honor higher than their advantages do not need alliances. When we go out from this presence, we ought to take the idea with us that we, too, are devoted to the purpose of enabling America to live her own life, to be the most just, the most progressive, the most honorable, the most enlightened nation in the world.

Mr. President, I have no racial or religious prejudice against any of the Caucasian races, and I would not discriminate against any of them, but as an American citizen, whose paternal ancestors fought with Washington and assisted in driving the British armies from American shores, I am in favor of the American people and the American Government against all races and against all nations. I believe that the sound political policy of the American people is to keep Europe out of America and to keep America out of Europe.

While we have no right to suggest what other governments should do with their surplus populations, we know that there are vast unoccupied countries which are open to colonization. Africa is a vast country, sparsely populated and of great natural resources almost wholly undeveloped. France, Italy, Belgium, and Great Britain have great dominions there which these people may occupy and develop. Let them go there and work and build up that country and establish their own forms of government as our forefathers did in America. We are not called upon to divide our country or our prosperity—the result of years of hardship, sacrifice, and industry—with them.

FOREIGN INFLUENCE

If we permit foreign nations to continue to colonize their nationals here as they have in the last few years, those of foreign blood will soon outnumber the American stock and control our Government. They are now exercising great influence in some sections of the country. There are many of them now among us who are opposing this legislation, not in their own interest but for that of the peoples of the countries from which they emigrated. Their opposition to legislation for the protection of American citizenship and American institutions is not creditable or patriotic. Their sympathies ought to be solely with America and Americans. It proves that residence and naturalization will not make Americans. The true and loyal American must be for his country in heart, soul, and body, and against all other peoples and all other governments whose interest conflict with our interest and safety.

Congress, I repeat, should declare that the present and future policy of the United States is opposed to the migrations of the nationals of other countries to its borders, and should pass appropriate legislation to enforce this policy.

THE PRESENT LAW

Mr. President, the adoption of a fixed policy is the important thing. The means for the enforcement of this policy are only secondary and can be changed from time to time as may be necessary for the exclusion of aliens. Congress has for years recognized the necessity of legislation restricting immigration. A bill for this purpose was passed in 1912 and vetoed by President Taft. What is known as the Burnett immigration bill, passed in 1917, contained about the same provisions as that bill. It prohibits the admission of immigrants who are idiots or insane, paupers, vagrants, polygamists, prostitutes, those afflicted with tuberculosis or any other loathsome, dangerous, or contagious disease, those convicted of felonies involving moral turpitude, anarchists and those who oppose all kinds of organized government, those who favor the assassination of public officers and unlawful destruction of public property, contract laborers and all aliens over 16 years physically capable who can not read the English or some other language, and any other delinquents, so as to prevent all undesirable immigration. This bill was vetoed because of the educational test, but it was passed notwithstanding and is now the law.

That bill did not go far enough—there was no restriction upon the number of immigrants, and too many loopholes for evasion. Congress, to remedy this defect, passed May 19, 1921, and continued in force for two years, by resolution May 11, 1922, what is known as the quota law, under which emigration from foreign countries was restricted to an annual quota equal to 3 per cent of the nationals of each particular nation already in the United States, as shown by the census of 1910, subject to the prohibitions and provisions of the Burnett law. This law does not apply to the other countries of North America nor those of South and Central America, and allows exceptions in favor of the relatives and dependents of residents in the United States and certain other nationals of other countries, as provided in the Burnett law, which it supplements.

The aggregate of the annual quota allowed under this law is 357,000, but almost an equal number may be admitted under the exceptions. The year before this law was passed we received 805,228 immigrants.

THE JOHNSON-REED BILL

Mr. President, the bill now under consideration, known as the Reed bill, reduces the annual quota of immigrants for each country to 2 per cent, based upon the census of 1910, which, with some exceptions to be stated, is practically the same as the Johnson bill just passed by the House of Representatives. The other countries of North America and those of Central and South America and the West India islands are not included in the quota restrictions, and immigrants as before are allowed to enter our country without limitation as to numbers. Officials of foreign governments and their families, aliens visiting the United States temporarily, as tourists, for business, study, or pleasure, and some others are also excepted from the quota restrictions.

There are no exceptions, as in the Burnett bill and subsequent legislation, in favor of the near relatives and dependents of immigrants in the United States, but preference under the quota limitation is given to the unmarried child under 21 years of age, father or mother over 55 years of age, the husband or the wife of a citizen of the United States, which is deemed sufficient to allow to come in those occupying these relations to all immigrants now in this country and who have manifested their determination to become Americans by being properly naturalized.

The bill also contains provisions requiring written applications of the nationals of other countries proposing to emigrate to the United States, to our consular agents abroad who are vested with broad powers and discretion in allowing or refusing certificates giving them the right of admission, subject, however, to be rejected at the port of entry if found to be undesirable immigrants within the provisions of the immigration laws of the United States. These provisions are believed to constitute a selective system in the country of the nativity of the immigrant, which, while it may not be perfect, is a step in advance and will eventually prevent the coming of all the undesirable and prohibitive class of immigrants to our shores.

The aggregate annual quota of immigrants allowed under the bill as reported to the Senate, 2 per cent based upon the census of 1910, exclusive of exceptions, is 240,459. There are sev-

amendments pending, one of which suspends all immigration for five years, excluding from the restrictions certain near relatives of the citizens of the United States and the class contained in the exceptions in the Reed bill, except that immigrants from Canada, Mexico, Central and South American countries are also excluded. Another amendment fixes the quota at 2 per cent and based upon the census of 1890 and applies to all countries, which will reduce the number of immigrants allowed to enter our country each year to 169,803, exclusive of the special exceptions contained in the bill under consideration. The bill also contains numerous administrative provisions which will greatly aid in controlling immigration and immigrants, and which I favor.

Mr. President, I will support the amendment proposing to suspend immigration to the United States for three years, with the exceptions stated hereinbefore liberally construed and administered in the cause of humanity and the just expectation of those whom we have already admitted to citizenship in this country and are now a part of us and Americans, because I believe, for the reasons which I have already stated, that it will require that time at least to assimilate those of foreign birth and some of foreign parentage now in this country, and without this we can not maintain the unity and harmony of our citizenship.

Should the Senate not approve this amendment, which is probable, I will then support the amendment fixing the annual quota at 2 per cent based upon the census of 1890, which was approved in the House by more than two-thirds majority, insuring that, if necessary, it will be passed over an Executive veto.

Mr. President, I will not go into any analysis of how the adoption of the census of 1890 will affect the different nations of the world. I will not discuss the protests of some of them, nor the supposed equities asserted. They have no rights to protest and no equities which we are called upon to recognize. The admission of their nationals to this country is not a matter of right and rests entirely upon comity and tolerance, which should not be permitted to interfere with the material interests of our country. The proposed law is solely for the benefit of America and Americans of to-day and for all future time. If it is discriminatory, it is in the interest and for the benefit of Americans and not because of any prejudice against other peoples. We will not discriminate against any nation for the benefit of another nation. When the law affects nations differently it is because it is required by the interests of our own people, for whom it is our right and duty to legislate.

I am frank to say that I believe if we must have immigration it is best for it to come from Great Britain and Ireland and the countries of western and northern Europe, as in the early days, as these people are more like our people in their characteristics and their ideas and principles of government conform more to ours than the peoples of southern Europe and Asia, and they are therefore more easily assimilated. But I can not now see how further immigration from any country can contribute to the safety, happiness, and prosperity of our people and the permanence of our Government, and I would be glad to see all immigration, with the exception hereinbefore stated in favor of relatives and others, prohibited for a reasonable time. This is for the interest of all Americans, whether they came early or last year.

Mr. President, the American people are aroused to the necessity of stopping the great migrations of aliens to our country, and they almost unanimously favor rigid restrictions, as provided in this legislation.

The great body of the American people, including the Sons of the American Revolution, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, and all the great patriotic organizations, and practically all of the civic, commercial, and political organizations of the country are earnestly supporting immigration restrictions and this bill. They voice the sovereign will of the American people and without further delay that will should be written into the law of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HARRIS, and others addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia. Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wonder if we can not get an agreement now to limit the debate so that we may come to a final vote on the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognized the Junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of discussing at length at this late hour in the debate the immigration bill—the general question. I wish merely to state my views and very briefly the reasons therefor.

On the day before yesterday we voted down the committee amendment which recognized the so-called gentlemen's agreement with Japan, and to-day we voted to place in the pending bill a provision which will exclude the Japanese altogether. Senators for whose views I have very great respect have found justification for their affirmative vote on the question just indicated in a veiled threat or implied threat contained in a letter from the Japanese ambassador to the Secretary of State. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I find no basis for my vote, which also was in the affirmative, on that question in anything that is or is not contained in the letter of the Japanese ambassador.

Whether the letter from the Japanese ambassador contains a veiled threat or an implied threat necessarily raises a question between two parties, and on that question Japan, as of right and in conformity with our method of dealing with all nations, is entitled to be heard. I am not, therefore, surprised, Mr. President, and I will not be surprised in the future, to hear the Japanese Government deny that in the letter of the Japanese ambassador there was contained any veiled or implied threat.

If that were the only justification for my vote on that important question, I should have voted in the negative. I am stating this, Mr. President, because the consideration which persuaded me to vote in the affirmative on the question to which I have referred is very largely controlling upon my vote upon the general question involved in the immigration bill before us. In other words, however we may seek to avoid the issue and however we may persuade ourselves that a false sort of diplomacy will enable us to state the issue in a way that will not disclose the true meaning of our act, I think that we must come to the conclusion that there are races of people that are not assimilable. They may be classed as wholly non-assimilable. There is no need to raise the question whether they can assimilate with us or we with them, or whether it is worth while to discuss the relative inferiority or superiority or equality of the two races. I do not desire to enter into a discussion of that question at all; but since there are races that are wholly unassimilable, it is my conviction that there are also peoples that are less assimilable than other peoples; and so, Mr. President, I should like to have a philosophy upon which I can base my position on the very important question of immigration, and I should like that philosophy to have some justification, at least in my own mind and conscience.

The question of immigration is the most important domestic question, certainly, before the Nation. Upon the determination of that question rests the future of America in a very vital way. The future ideals of America are involved in the proper solution of that question. Our industry and our agriculture can not hope to escape the effect of the immigration measure finally adopted by the Congress. Indeed, the question is one that underlies and overshadows all other questions.

I do not agree that the unrestricted immigration to which we were once accustomed presented but one evil, and therefore that immigration legislation must take into consideration the correction of one evil only. I heard the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to-day in the Senate declare that our immigration legislation was primarily based upon a consideration of American labor and the standards of American labor. That his statement is true, certainly in part, no man would deny; but I do not think that the policy of unrestricted immigration presents a single evil. It undoubtedly is true that under the policy of unrestricted immigration the total number of immigrants coming into the country reached the enormous total of 1,200,000 in one year. This mass, of course, made itself felt upon the body of American laborers, made itself felt upon the standards of American life, made itself felt upon the American home—unquestionably so. About 1880, however, and certainly as late as 1890, the character of the immigrant himself had changed, and instead of the natural infiltration of the immigrants coming to this country seeking a new and a better home, we had the unfortunate and disagreeable experience of opening our doors or of continuing to hold them open to vast numbers of immigrants who were coming not into a virgin and a growing and a young nation but into a nation already settled, which had already reached the stage of comparative manhood.

So, Mr. President, there were two evils. One was presented in the sheer number of immigrants coming, and the other in the character and in the class of the immigrants coming. About 1880, and certainly as late as 1890, as I have just said, the immigrant coming to this country established his own quarter; he established his own section; he established his own institutions; he established his own printing presses. In

fact, he solidified himself, and out of his solidity grew a form, consciously or unconsciously, of aggression; and this was precisely the cause of the restless and unhappy mood and attitude of the old or native stock.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I should ask him a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I have just come into the Chamber, and I heard the last sentence of the Senator, namely, that following a certain year a large number of immigrants came into the United States, they established their own quarters, they solidified themselves, and assumed rather an aggressive mood.

Mr. GEORGE. No; I did not say that.

Mr. KING. The idea of aggression at any rate was implied as I interpreted the Senator's remarks.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly; but may I state it to the Senator?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. In the solidification of the new immigration there was necessarily born, consciously or unconsciously, this spirit of aggressiveness under which the native stock—and that was the point I was emphasizing—manifested more or less restiveness and unhappiness.

Mr. KING. Then the Senator was alluding to the native stock having a spirit of aggressiveness, of resentment, rather than the immigrant?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly so, and alluding to the cause of it, in my candid judgment.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think—perhaps it is not germane to what the Senator is discussing—that the fact that the immigrant established himself in a quarter, rather isolated himself from the mass of the American people, resulted largely because of the exclusive manifestations of the native population? We did not welcome them in the way that perhaps they thought we should welcome them, and perhaps in the way that we should have welcomed them if we sought their prompt assimilation. We crowded them into the more forbidding parts of congested districts of the United States; we gave them the lowest class of work—that which paid the least—and we made them feel that they were inferior to us. We assumed—that is the view of some, and I am inclined to think there is very much truth in it—a superiority over them; and the tendency of our manifestations was to make them herd together, to become gregarious, because they felt that we were drawing a line of cleavage between the American citizen, the native born, and the immigrant. Does not the Senator think that much of the situation is due to the failure of the people of the United States to adopt a proper attitude toward the immigrant, to provide means of Americanization, and to provide legitimate and proper means more quickly to assimilate the immigrant into the social organism?

Mr. GEORGE. I am perfectly willing to admit that in large measure what the Senator says may be true, and for the purposes of my statement here it might be admitted that it is wholly true. I do not admit that it is wholly true, but there undoubtedly is a great deal of force in what the Senator has had to say. The important point, however, Mr. President, is that, whether the fault be upon our side or upon the side of the immigrant, the fact—and the fact only that I desire to emphasize—is that precisely the condition I was attempting to describe exists.

Mr. President, neither in my discussion nor in my thought of the question do I compare one race with another, much less one nation with another. I know that America always should strive as far as possible, consistently with its own best interest, first, to give no offense to any other nation. I know that it has been our policy from the first to have a decent regard for the opinions of mankind, and I am not considering, and in my thought of the immigration question I never have considered the question of the inferiority or the superiority of my own race or of any race. We can not shut our eyes to one fact, however, and that is that after 1890 the immigrants coming into the United States did establish their quarters, did live in their own districts, did establish their own institutions, did establish their newspaper presses, and in large measure set up conditions that tended to preserve the alienage which they brought into the country.

It may be that we were very largely responsible for that. It may be that we are in very great measure responsible for that condition; but we can not remedy the character of our own people wholly, any more than we can control and remedy and reform the character of those people who come to us from other countries. So, Mr. President, just as this Nation 40 years

ago declared exclusion against Chinese immigration and Mongolian immigration, and just as to-day we have placed total exclusion against Japanese immigration, and upon the final ground that those races are nonassimilable, it seems to me that we must take into consideration the character of other peoples who come to us with reference to the very question of the ease or the difficulty with which we can assimilate them.

That, Mr. President, is the basis upon which I shall vote on this question of immigration. That is the basic reason upon which I shall act, as nearly as I can make my vote represent my convictions, my vote on this question.

Mr. President, when we think of the Chinese and the Japanese—and I refer to them not because I wish to arouse for one moment any sort of antagonistic sentiment or spirit upon the part of the Chinese or Japanese—we must think of them as industrious peoples. We must remember that the labor of these peoples built the great Pacific railways. We must remember that they developed a great system of agriculture in the West. We must think of them as law-abiding, as men of reasonably correct habits. We must think of them, Mr. President, as children of a very ancient civilization. They possess a culture that was old while yet all of Europe was peopled by naked savages. They possess a culture and are the children of a culture that was old when the civilization and culture of Greece and of Rome were young. When Senators speak about the glorious examples that every race and every nation can present to us, and when they remind us that in the trenches with our own sons in the World War were the sons of the immigrant citizen of America, we may well ask, if we view the question courageously and fairly and candidly, What has that to do with the question? What has it to do with the question at all?

No man is more ready to admit, and no man more cheerfully admits, that from every race, indeed, from every land, have come illustrious citizens who by their achievements have made our Nation great in peace and in war. But what has that to do with the question?

Mr. President, we have in America a peculiar government, a self-government that is peculiar to the people of America. That Government has many very great excellencies, but it has no excellency that makes it fit and proper for every race of men that live upon the globe, nor can you fit every race of men, whatever may be their excellencies, to our form of government.

Washington was a fairly good American. He had a fairly good view of the character of our people at the date and on the occasion when he delivered his Farewell Address to the people of the United States, and he felicitated the people of the United States in this language:

With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles.

Washington regarded these things as fundamental, certainly as significant. He was emphasizing these things. He knew, as well as we know, that he had in his own army atheist and Protestant and Catholic, but in his calm judgment there was no such vital difference of religious principle as prevented the men in the Revolutionary Army acknowledging loyalty to the same essential political principles. There were Jews in his army and Gentiles in his army, but Washington did not regard those differences as making it impossible, or even difficult, for the men who made up the Nation at the time of the Revolution, and at the time that he was President of this Nation, to hold to the same general principles of self-government. But he undoubtedly recognized that in the slight shades of difference, so far as religion and manners and habits and matters of principle were concerned, lay the security, or a part of the strength and stability of our form of government, and that fact I think he meant to emphasize.

The attitude of Mr. Jefferson and the party of Mr. Jefferson has been referred to here to-day. No longer ago than yesterday there was quoted in this Record the language of Mr. Jefferson, and I read that language again:

While we are providing for the fortification of our country against a foreign foe, I am in favor of fortifying it against the influx of undesirable immigration.

He used the word "undesirable." That language was used, Mr. President, when this country was a very young Nation, when all the great West was yet undeveloped, when we needed people. Even in that early time the founder of the Democratic Party, Mr. Jefferson, was expressing himself about this important question, and he had the courage to express himself candidly and frankly on it. I think the big part of the whole immigration question is to be found in the candor and in the frankness with which we shall meet and face and solve our problems.

When the Chinese exclusion laws of 40 years ago were passed there were liberal Americans who said, "You affront a great people. You make for yourself trouble. You raise perplexing questions." Mr. President, I congratulate myself at least that the statesmen of 40 years ago had the courage to face the question fairly, and to-day I do not believe China regards more highly any nation on the face of this globe than she regards the United States of America.

More is to be gained by a clear and definite statement of those policies that are indispensable to national existence than by any sort of diplomatic language designed to cover up the essential principle that must control our actions. I do not see the necessity of it, Mr. President; I can not appreciate the necessity of it. It is not a question of superiority or inferiority. It is the question of the assertion of a purely national right, and there is but one question about it, What is the wise policy? How ought it to be settled?

If you go back to your newspapers of 40 years ago, you will read the language of the liberal and tolerant American giving vent to his fears because of the policy then about to be adopted with reference to China. Yet we know perfectly well how China has received and how she has accepted what we regarded as a necessary policy on our part. Precisely the same thing will occur in the case of Japan, I think, because she is a great nation, because we make no question of superiority or inferiority, but because we insist upon a right that is purely national, purely domestic, and because we have the courage and the candor and the frankness to say that we are doing it upon the ground that—

East is east and west is west,
And never the twain shall meet.

There is a good deal more history in that than poetry. There is no occasion for excitement about it, but there is less occasion for apology about it. I believe, and I believe it has been true, so far as our actions in the past with reference to the Chinese and the yellow races in general are concerned, that Japan will recognize the full wisdom of our course; but I know that there can never be a question concerning anything but the wisdom of our course.

Therefore, Mr. President, I took occasion to say, and I take occasion to repeat, that I could not vote on the proposition to exclude the Japanese from this country upon the ground that in a message or letter of the Japanese ambassador I had found a veiled or implied threat.

I know that that raises a question between two people, and on that question both are entitled to be heard, but I vote on the broad ground that we are settling a domestic question, a vitally necessary and indispensable question, and because we shall fairly and candidly settle it upon the basis that two races are not assimilable, that we are dealing with a question which only this Nation has the right to decide.

So I think that in determining the broader question involved in this immigration measure before us we must of necessity keep in mind the ease or difficulty with which separate races and the nationals of other nations can be assimilated, can be absorbed, without injury to them or to us, if we want to consider their interests, but certainly without injury to us.

I recognize perfectly well, so far as I am concerned, that some races are more easily assimilable, some races and some peoples are more easily absorbable into our body politic, and without injury to us. If I did not recognize that I would not vote for any measure that seemed to me to discriminate against any nation. I do not like the word "discriminate," because it has no proper place in my discussion of the immigration question. I know that the question is a big one, and it is so big that any Senator has perfect justification for shades of view upon the bill and the important question presented in the bill before the Senate. But, so far as I am concerned, it does seem to me that, inasmuch as I can recognize that certain races are nonassimilable, I have no difficulty in realizing that the nationals from certain nations or certain peoples are less easily assimilable than those from others.

I believe in the principle contained in the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. I believe very thoroughly in that principle. I do not believe in that principle because I think that by the adoption of it I shall give no offense to any other nation. If I mean and intend no offense, I do not fear the giving of offense, and I have tried to make it perfectly plain that in my thinking on the question of immigration I do not take into consideration so much the question of inferiority or of superiority, or even of equality of races or of nations.

The principle involved in the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, as I understand it, is this,

that after a date fixed, Congress shall fix the total of immigration to be admitted in any one year, and shall apportion that total to the various nations in exact accordance with their proportionate representation in the whole population of the United States at the present time, with certain exceptions, of course, of those whom the Senator himself has pointed out.

I believe that amendment is a good amendment and is a wise amendment, because I believe that the amendment will in actual application permit to come into the United States a larger number of easily assimilable people and a smaller number, relatively a very small number, of those people more difficult of absorption or assimilation.

Therefore, I believe that the principle stated in the amendment is sound. It can not give any offense even to the nations who have a feeling upon the question of emigration. There is but one possible objection to it and that objection is this: As yet the basis to be used in the Senator's amendment has not been fixed; at least it is not officially declared. I think it is highly desirable that we should finally fix our immigration policy; in other words, I can not think we should longer enact a law which in its very nature expires by its own terms or is understood at the time of its adoption to have only temporary application.

Since the basis on which the quota is to be applied is now not definitely fixed and determined, or, at least, officially determined, I do not like the idea of passing an immigration law and leaving it open for future action by the Congress—that is, in the terms of the law itself inviting action by the Congress. Of course, I recognize that the Congress can at any time in the future, and will from time to time in the future, I have no doubt, deal with the great question of immigration. At the same time, I believe it highly desirable at this time that we settle upon a fixed policy of immigration, and that we put it in effect as speedily as possible.

Now, my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], has an amendment pending which will exclude for a fixed period all immigration. I must say very candidly that I do not see the necessity of that amendment. I will vote with my colleague on it because he sees the necessity of it, but I myself do not recognize the necessity of total exclusion of all immigration even for a stated or a given number of years.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HARRIS. It is very kind of my colleague to vote for my amendment when he does not see the necessity of it, but he does not state my amendment as it is. We define an immigrant and make certain exceptions—for instance, a Government official, his family and attendants, aliens visiting the United States temporarily, tourists for business, study, or pleasure, an alien in continued transit through the United States, children of foreigners, children of foreign-born American citizens—the children being under 18 years of age—and a father and mother who are over 55 years of age. So far as I am concerned, that lets in more than I would like to have come in. I would really like to limit it more than that.

Mr. GEORGE. I recognize what my colleague says is, of course, true, that his amendment does contain certain exceptions, but I was about to say that I do not see the necessity at this time of the amendment. There might have been great necessity for such an amendment immediately following the World War. We anticipated that there would probably be a larger number of immigrants coming into the country than had hitherto come in during any given period. But my real objection, if I have a real objection to my colleague's amendment, is this: It also leaves open the final determination, or the determination of what we must hope to be a relatively final solution, of the whole question of immigration. I think it ought to be settled.

I have often heard Senators give expression about the will of the people and the speedy enactment into law of the will of the people. If that is a valid consideration, if it is one that must be given force and effect by an American Congress—and, of course, it has its weight—I do not believe there can be much doubt but that the people of the United States are as nearly unanimous upon the question as they can be upon any great question which offers so much justification for honest difference of opinion and view. I believe that they favor restriction, and very rigid restriction, but I think they also favor legislation in its nature and character permanent, using the word in its relative sense.

Therefore, I think, as highly desirable as my colleague's amendment may have been just after the conclusion of the World War or as it may be now for certain purposes, that it still leaves open the big question of immigration, leaves it for

the future consideration of Congress, and it seems to me that we ought to settle upon a definite policy. It seems to me that we are able to settle upon a definite policy now.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt my colleague? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to his colleague?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I wonder if my colleague does not agree with me that if we prohibit immigration for five years we can then be in a position to settle the question better than at this time, because the war and the after-war conditions will be gone.

Mr. GEORGE. Possibly so. I should hope so. I am giving to my colleague the benefit of every doubt upon the question. I am going to vote with him on his amendment, but I am expressing my views upon the question. I am saying that his amendment has merit and it has at least the merit, when offered by him, to induce me to give it my support.

With that I pass merely to a final statement, and that is the statement with reference to the quota. I have no difficulty in supporting the substitute offered by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I believe it, perhaps, to be the wise policy to adopt in the matter. I believe that we should take the census of 1890, not because the census of 1890 discriminates against any people or discriminates in favor of any nation, but because, as I believe, the census of 1890 will approximate most nearly to the basis of the computation fixed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

I do not take his amendment nor the census of 1890 upon any reason other than this: Both the census of 1890 and the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania seem to me to admit the largest number of assimilable, wholly assimilable, easily assimilable, races into the United States, and to exclude those races or the people from those nations that are with most difficulty absorbed into our life without injury to us. In making this final statement permit me to repeat that the whole question is one of such broadness and one of such great importance as to admit of very great variety of opinion and of marked and strong differences of view about it. But it does seem to me in the discussion of the question that we should discuss it candidly and frankly, without regard to the question of inferiority or superiority or equality of races that so often finds its way into a discussion of the immigration question.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I submit the unanimous-consent agreement which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m., on the calendar day of April 17, 1924, debate shall be limited upon the bill (S. 2576) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes, so that no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed agreement?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have taken no time in the discussion of the bill and I have no present intention of doing so. It seems to me the Senate is making progress, and because the Senate regards the bill as of very great importance I do not think the Senator should ask for a cloture rule at this time. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah objects.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I then ask unanimous consent that when the Senate shall conclude its business to-day it will take a recess until noon to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to the Senator's request, but I desire to ask for the information of the Senate whether he has given consideration to the matter of holding night sessions upon the bill? It is a measure very important and other bills are crowding for consideration. It seems to me the Senate might well devote some time in the evening to the pending bill. Has the Senator considered that matter?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, but I have been hoping that we may have a limitation of debate. I had understood when I offered the consent agreement at this time that there would be no objection to it, but apparently I had not reconnoitered my ground sufficiently. If we can not agree to limit debate, we shall have to hold a night session either to-night or to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIS. I hope the Senator will persist in that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not object, but I suggest to the Senator that he give notice if the bill is not concluded to-morrow we shall have a session to-morrow night. That will give everyone notice and perhaps hurry the measure along.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have been hoping that we would run rather late this afternoon and continue the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania that when the Senate shall have concluded its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REED of Missouri obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that from all I can learn there will be no difficulty in having the pending bill disposed of by day after to-morrow. That is the reason why I objected to cloture.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] suggested cloture 10 days ago. I then said that I thought the bill too important to ask it. I myself suggested cloture on Monday. I was then told that four Senators had indicated their desire to speak, and that until they had finished I had best withhold the request. I was told a little while ago that all objection had been withdrawn. That is the reason I submitted the request, but I very much hope that the Senate will see fit to limit debate within the next day or two.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think probably the Senator from Pennsylvania was informed subsequently to the conversation that I had with him by some Senator that I had withdrawn my objection to a limitation of debate at this time. After some opportunity shall have been afforded to discuss amendments which may have been offered from the floor and that are not in order now I shall be perfectly willing to limit debate; but it would be a very unusual proceeding in the Senate to limit debate before the committee amendments have been disposed of and before amendments offered upon the floor are in order.

If the Senator from Pennsylvania will be patient, and will give us merely a reasonable time to discuss amendments which may be offered upon the floor—and on to-morrow, I think, we shall get to that order—so far as I am concerned, I shall be perfectly willing to agree to a time to vote.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I understood that that was the feeling of the Senator from North Carolina, and it was not until I had received the information that he felt an agreement would be in order now that I ventured to make the suggestion which I have made.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was an entire mistake, Mr. President. As I said to the Senator from Pennsylvania this morning, I will not consent to a limitation upon debate until some opportunity shall have been given to discuss amendments which are offered to the bill from the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for just a moment in order that I may make a personal explanation?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] has stated, I have been trying to get action on the immigration bill for some time. I misunderstood the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] in discussing the question with him. I have been waiting here to hear the Senator's speech for two or three days, and he has been anxious to get the floor. He told me, as I stated this morning, that he would wait until the amendments came up in the regular order on the bill; and I understood that he had withdrawn his objection to considering amendments under the 10-minute rule; and I so stated to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I should like to give notice now that if the immigration bill shall not have been disposed of by to-morrow afternoon, I shall ask the Senate to remain in session to-morrow night in order to continue its consideration.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, at this late hour in the discussion of the bill, with full knowledge that probably every Senator has made up his mind on the subject, and with but few Members of the Senate in the Chamber, I do not

presume to think that I shall change a single vote, or that my remarks will have any other present effect than to register my own views regarding this character of legislation. I shall try to do that briefly.

There has been introduced into the bill a principle in which I firmly believe and which I advocated on the floor some years ago, and that is the principle that immigrants shall be examined, their character ascertained, and their fitness for residence or citizenship in the United States determined by some board representing this country. I recognize the fact, as we all have recognized the truth, that there are in every country undesirables who are no credit to their native land and who would be of no advantage to this country. By the establishment of such a tribunal every undesirable could be excluded, except a very small percentage who might succeed in deceiving some American tribunal appointed to pass upon their fitness for citizenship. So that, with that provision in the bill and assuming that it will be fairly enforced, we will be protected against an influx of people who are, to use the oft-repeated expression, nonassimilable; and, with that principle in the bill, all that is left is to restrict the number of people coming to the United States who will make good citizens after arrival. Assuming that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania to which I have just referred shall become a part of the measure, the bill ought to be entitled "a proposal to bar from the United States all human beings who will make good citizens of the United States if they exceed the number of 160,000." The proposition stated in that way is an absurdity, because we are denying to ourselves the addition of a population that will amalgamate with our so-called native population and will make good and valuable citizens of the country.

Every argument as to the undesirability of races is removed; every argument as to the undesirability of certain citizens of different nations is removed the moment we establish tribunals judicially to examine and pass upon the qualifications of the individual. So that we are brought here face to face with the naked proposition of excluding people who will make good citizens and who our own tribunals have declared will make good citizens. I repeat, that is the last word in know-nothingism, and I use the term "know-nothingism" in the political sense in which it was employed when know-nothingism raised its ugly, vicious, and ignorant head in the United States, with the result that one political party went out of business.

There can be but one justification for a restriction upon immigration, and that is that the individual coming here is not fit to live here after he gets here. But when we have set up our own tribunals and have judicially examined into the character of the applicant and have determined that he is fit to live here after he gets here, and then exclude him, we are doing a very absurd if not a very wicked thing.

Mr. President, every human being who is capable of supporting himself and who is capable of making and who will make a good citizen of the United States is an addition to the moral, the intellectual, the physical, and the financial assets of the United States. The fact that a man happened to be born on the other side of the red line of the map does not make his presence here any less valuable than that of a man who happened to be born on this side of the line if the two men are equal in character and equal in their love for this country. It is as absurd to exclude from this country a good man who will make a good citizen as it would be to expel a good man who is also equally a good citizen.

I do not expect to stop this craze; I do not expect to arrest this movement; but I say that it is one of the narrowest and most contemptible movements that ever cursed the American people. Here are two of God's children. One of them happened to be born under the flag of some European monarch, but we take him and judicially examine him.

We find that he wants to leave that monarch's rule because he loves liberty. We find that he is intelligent. We find that he is attached to American institutions. We find that he wants to move into a land where he and his children may enjoy the blessings of liberty, and we say to that human being, "You shall not enter here. It is true when you come you are well intentioned toward our Government; it is true you will support yourself; it is true you will add to the wealth of this country; it is true you are of such a character that you and your children can be amalgamated into and assimilated with the present population of the United States; and yet, because you happen to have been born under another flag than ours, you shall not enter these holy precincts of the United States. When you come as an adult, you are worth actually in the market, as an asset to the country, a large amount of money."

To refuse admission to this country of men who have been determined to be of the character I have referred to is as absurd as it would be for the president of a bank to refuse gold at his counter, and it is as narrow as the proscriptive spirit that has run through the ages and has cursed the world.

More than that, the absurdity is increased by the fact that many men who are supporting this bill have recently been talking about democratizing the world, of carrying the benefits of our civilization elsewhere for the benefit of the world, of uniting with the other nations of the world to set up a sort of world tribunal or world government, and doing this for the benefit of other nations and other races whom they in turn say can not be democratized enough to become American citizens when they come here swearing by the Almighty God in whom they believe that their purpose is to become good American citizens, and when we judicially determine that they are capable of that achievement and that that is the purpose of their hearts and the intention of their souls.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to whom I have listened with profound respect the few times that he has favored us with his views, and for whose mastery of logic and honesty of purpose I have the highest regard, said in the closing part of his speech that this was not a question of race superiority at all, but that that question could be disregarded.

Mr. President, it can not be disregarded. It is the very essence of this whole question; but I claim that it will be eliminated from the question if we adopt that provision of the bill which proposes to set up tribunals to determine the fitness of the prospective citizen, for, under that, if an individual is of such race or such blood or such character that he can not be assimilated into the white population of the United States and become a part of the great spirit of America, then he could be and would be properly rejected by any such tribunal.

Mr. President, I have said that this spirit of proscription and narrowness has come down through the ages. There has not been a race of men who have ever established themselves upon this earth but have assumed that they were God's chosen children. They have set up barriers against the stranger. In the savage days they imprisoned him or slaughtered him if he entered within their domains; and just in proportion as they adhered to that narrow policy they have circumscribed their own well-being and limited their own development; and just in proportion as nations have recognized the fact that they are only one of the great family of nations, just in proportion as they have generously opened their doors to the peoples of other countries, have nations grown into magnitude and power.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. I was rather impressed until the Senator made this speech that he was against the league; that he thought we ought to live exclusively by ourselves.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator has been properly impressed. The difference, perhaps, between the Senator's view and mine is this: He thinks we ought to go over into another man's country and interfere over there, but that we should stop that man from coming here when he wants to come voluntarily and join us. We just differ on that.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator another question? Then I presume the difference is this: If the Senator sees a row in the street, he wants to bring it into his own home and have it in his parlor instead of having it out there?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no; but if I thought enough of a man to go out and interfere in his own in the street and hunt a chance to get into it and try to set myself up to boss him over there I would think that probably he was a good enough fellow, if he came here and asked the privilege of living in America, to let him come.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. If I thought a man was such a bad man that I was not willing to do anything for him in Europe, I would not want to incorporate him in with my own people.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That may be the Senator's view. I do not think they are too bad to do anything for them. I never have taken that view. What I have said is that they are not good enough to set up a government in which we will be a minority, and by their votes, as citizens of other countries, to control us.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Has the Senator no confidence in them as long as they live beyond the seas, but is he perfectly willing

to incorporate them with our own people and let them control us here at home?

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator, as usual, discusses a question that is as foreign to the question I am discussing as the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Mr. CARAWAY. At least—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Now, wait a minute, until I answer the Senator. I have said that where there are governments in Europe, monarchies and republics, loyal unto themselves and their people loyal unto themselves, I was unwilling to enter into a super world government in which we would be a minority party, and those people, who may be our enemies, and who may have many interests opposed to us, would control the policy of America by their votes. That is a very different proposition than denying admission to this country to an individual of any other nation who comes here and says: "I want to join your country. I want to swear allegiance to your flag. I am willing to live by your rules and die by your rules." If the Senator can not see that distinction, it is because he has put aside his usually very acute intellect for the purpose of merely trying to nag me, which is his long suit in life, and if he ever lost that he would die.

Now, I proceed.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I suggest to the Senator that I put in pretty nearly half my time defending the Senator instead of nagging him?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Why, certainly; and when the Senator is doing that, that is what gives him his good standing in this body. Otherwise, the Senator makes mistakes.

Now, let me proceed. I say that in one breath people are preaching here world love and the universal brotherhood of man; that there should be a super world government; that we should join in it; that we should go out democratizing the world; and then the same gentlemen refuse to permit a lover of liberty, a lover of democracy, to come here and swear allegiance to our flag. It, however, is a minor incident in what I am saying, and I refer to it only to impress the absurdity of this whole movement.

I was saying, Mr. President, when I was interrupted, that you can take the history of the nations of this world, and the only nations that have made great progress are the nations that have been reasonably liberal in the matter of admitting the peoples of other countries within their own domain. The nation which built a Chinese wall about itself limited its opportunities, circumscribed its career, and arrested its march of progress. Those nations that are composed of the mixed bloods of many peoples are the nations that have controlled this world from the very first.

Rome was composed of many peoples and of many bloods. France is composed of many stocks. She first took her great place in the world after the Franks had swept down from the forests of Germany and established themselves as a part of the people of ancient Gaul.

Great Britain, which boasts of her lineage, must admit her admixture with the Romans, with the Norsemen, with the Angles and the Saxons who came in from Germany and grafted themselves upon the original stock of the British Isles.

Germany herself is composed of many different tribes and many different peoples.

Austria in like manner was composed of many peoples.

It is in the admixture, the flux of humanity passing back and forth, that nations get their virility and their life and their energy, and the thing that has given to the American citizen his peculiar dominance in the world—for with all his shortcomings, I regard him as the most dominant character in the world—is the fact that he is the product of the admixture of many races.

So this policy of exclusion, which began originally by killing every man who was a stranger in the land, then gradually broadened itself until they were admitted in some countries with generosity—this policy of exclusion has been a part of our national history. This movement that we have in the Senate to-day is as old as America. It seems to me that the first individual who set his foot on the soil of America turned around and looked across the sea and said to all his own brethren he had left behind, "None of you at all can come over here. I am the native-born American citizen." That is rather an extreme statement, but it illustrates a general situation.

Some Englishman came over here, then some Englishmen were sent over here; then some Irishmen came over here, and the English told the Irish they were not fit to settle here. Then some Germans came over and some Dutch came over, and away back, immediately succeeding the Revolution, we had this same struggle.

There has been talk here to-day about these foreigners coming here and settling in communities. They have done it from the first. There is no change in that. Go over to Pennsylvania. It appears from a document which was brought to me, and which I put in the Record in the speech I made on this matter before, that so great a man as Benjamin Franklin, away back in his day, warned the people that this country was going to be turned into a European province, for over in Pennsylvania they actually transacted the business in the German language, and they actually used it in their courts. The Germans were there in such dominant numbers that he came to believe that a foreign principality was to be established on our soil, and when I remember that Benjamin Franklin made that mistake, with all his wisdom, I do not wonder that the statesmen of this day naturally will fall into error.

Yet what happened in Pennsylvania? What occurred with reference to this population that herded together so that they used their own native language instead of using the American language? Is there any better State than Pennsylvania? Are there any better people than the Pennsylvanians? Are they a discredit to our Nation? Are they an asset to us in peace? Are they a source of strength to us in time of war? Have they added to the sum total of the moral standing and intellectual power of the people of the United States? Yet these people herded at that time.

When the Irish first came here they came very largely, the great influx after the famine days. They were poor, they were ragged, they came in the steerage of ships. They were denounced. The highbrows met in indignation in all parts of the country.

The gentleman with proscriptive soul was there. He declared the Irish would ruin this country, because, he said, they were ignorant; and they were ignorant, largely ignorant because a tyrannical government has closed their schools and persecuted their schoolmasters and had closed the door of learning in their face. They were poor. Poverty and want had put its white finger upon them and reduced them to a condition of absolute starvation. They came here and herded together. They slept in shanties. Some of them lived in the most impoverished and desperate condition for many years. Yet who is it to-day who dares in America denounce a man of Irish lineage? They are numbered among our orators, our poets, our statesmen. The sons of those immigrants have taken their place proudly with the rest of the people.

Then the German came, and the German was abused. He herded. There are German colonies all over the United States, in which gradually the language disappears, gradually the racial characteristics become less and less. They melt into the great community. But they have herded, just as we hear the cry of herding now. Yet I venture to say, in the face of that spirit which still exists succeeding the war, when every effort was made to fan the hatred of this country for that race because we were at war with their country, that the German citizen has contributed his full share to the greatness of America.

I see upon this map the great number of people coming from Austria is pictured as a warning. I remember very well when they came from Austria—from a Province of Austria, from Bohemia. They came here in the steerage. They rode West in immigrant trains. They came off the cars with the odor of the filthy passage they had been compelled to endure. Few of them had any money. They settled in colonies. I saw them as they walked with their wooden shoes on the depot platform, the old women carrying feather beds upon their backs, and cooking utensils, the men wearing leather waistcoats that had been handed down, it appeared to me, from past generations. They went out in the country and settled and lived in sod houses. They were regarded as a scourge. All of the alarmists were there; all of these native-born American citizens were there to denounce the poor Bohemian. Yet I lived to see the sons and daughters of those people enter the public schools, and I entered with them. I found that about as hard a competitor as I had to meet in my classes was a Bohemian boy or girl. The men grew into stalwart Americans, and the girls were as beautiful as any of the so-called American aristocrats whose "granddaddy" happened to have come here, instead of the father.

I have witnessed the proscriptive movements. I have seen the man who says, "I am better than thou art," the fellow who thinks that the country would suffer if anybody was in any manner different from him. Yet 99 times out of 100 the man of that sort is the man who lacks the breadth of judgment and the charity to recognize the fact that the peoples of all countries and of all lands have their good and their bad; that they have their geniuses and have their sloths; that they have

their patriots and have their traitors. But in the great mass of the white race of Europe you find splendid men and splendid women who, given a decent opportunity of life, will make good American citizens—the great mass of them.

In our Fourth of July days we used to think that courage was the peculiar heritage of the American people; but the late war demonstrated to us and demonstrated to the world that the peoples of Europe can stand and fight and die as valiantly, I will say—almost as valiantly, at least—as can our own sons.

We used to think that we knew all there was in civilization. Yet their schools of art and their wonderful achievements in music answer back to us that we have much to learn from the Old World.

We used to think that we were the great inventive race of the world. Yet when we came into contact with the arts of invention that were employed in the late war by European nations, we learned that there were other brains that could think, and that there were other hands that were cunning. When we survey the field of scientific achievement, we must sit at the feet of the savants of Europe quite as often as they sit at our feet.

When we look at the march of progress that has gone on in this world, we are bound, if our vision be not clouded, to have regard for the fact that while we have been cultivating education here in point of literacy we are far below every European state. Sweden leads the list in literacy, closely followed by Germany, and in several European countries we find that there is a lower degree of ignorance than there is in the United States among our own native-born population.

Moreover, when we examine the figures—and I put them all in the Record when this debate was on before—we find the startling fact that the citizens of foreign countries send a greater percentage of their children to school than do the native born American citizens.

The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] has offered an amendment to exclude all immigrants for five years. I do not want to speak disrespectfully of Georgia, and I do not; it is a great State, with a great history; but in point of literacy, the white population of Georgia is far below the white population of Norway, or of Sweden, or of Denmark, or of Germany, or of Holland, or of Switzerland.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, I know the Senator means no disrespect to my State. He said he did not.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think it is a wonderful State.

Mr. GEORGE. What I want to ask the Senator is this, is not the presence there of a different race, in very large numbers—

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am speaking of the white population.

Mr. GEORGE. I know; but has not the other race something to do with that condition?

Mr. REED of Missouri. With dragging down the white?

Mr. GEORGE. Is there not some relation between the two?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not know. The Senator would have to answer that for himself. I say this, I think when we consider conditions in the Southern States—and in that I will include my own State, for we are semisouthern, at least—I think we will agree that that part of the country suffered so from the Civil War that in the recovery from the economic conditions those States were retarded in the matter of education; but there is the condition, without criticism. I am simply saying that it is proposed to exclude the people of other lands, to exclude a man because of his race. We should exclude him because of his character, but not because of his race. If his character is bad, let those tribunals find it out and close the door in his face, but if his character is good let the door swing open. When I say his character is good, I mean when his character for citizenship is good.

When did we get this way? I picked up a paper this morning and read the statement that a Russian woman had solved the riddle of the ages which from the days of Hippocrates down to this hour has puzzled all of the students of disease and medicine. She had discovered a remedy for leprosy. I do not know, but she is quite as likely to discover it as though she had not happened to have been born in Russia.

We talk about the wonders of radium. A French woman solved that problem. So I might, if I wanted to, stand here until to-morrow morning reciting the achievements of other races. You propose to say to people of that kind, "keep out," and you propose to say it based upon a fallacy which I propose to expose in a moment. Let me dwell on this a moment. There sits upon the Supreme Court bench of these United

States a man who would be excluded by the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Georgia—

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think the Senator means to bring me in, because I did not offer the amendment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I meant the senior Senator from Georgia. I misstated myself, but I understood the Senator to approve it, and I was sorry to hear him say it, for there is nothing unkindly in my remarks, as the Senator knows.

There sits upon the Supreme Court bench of the United States a man who once honored this Chamber by his genius and his intelligence, who was born outside of the United States—born in England. There sat here nearly 30 years a great Senator who landed in this country when he was 8 years of age with one silver dollar in his pocket, the late Knute Nelson, the Norwegian. Was there ever a better American citizen, one who loved his country more?

There sit in this Chamber to-day two or three or four men who I understand were born in other countries. I see the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON] here. I have traveled all over that great State of his. If we would take the Swedes and the Norwegians and the Danes out of Minnesota we would almost depopulate it, and most of them came there in my lifetime. As we go over that State we find its farms are beautiful; we find its people largely with names that indicate they are of Scandinavian origin. What did those people do when they got here? They went up there and took a piece of prairie that was not doing anybody on earth any good; was not even a pasture for buffalo any more, for the buffalo were not there.

They plowed that sod, they planted it and raised crops. They built habitations and barns. They reared children and established schools and erected churches. They became a part of the great body politic of the United States, and they have been just as good citizens as some of those people whose grandfathers happened to come here instead of the individuals themselves coming. Would we add to our wealth if we obliterated the greater part of Minnesota? Why, somebody will say they went in crowds. They did. We find a large percentage of the population there of Scandinavian origin. Naturally when one man goes from a country and locates he writes home to tell his brethren about it, and they come and write to their brethren, and we thus get a certain concentration of people.

Where did this narrow spirit of proscription come from? This used to be the land of the free and the home of the brave. It used to be taught that here was a habitation for the oppressed of the earth. We remember that along the lines of Lexington, at Concord, at Valley Forge, at Yorktown, there stood many races of men, speaking many languages. I think there were 36 different languages spoken in New York before the Revolution. They had many religions. Some of them did not have any religion. They all had the religion of liberty in their hearts, their divine fires of God Almighty planted in the hearts of men, the divine fires of liberty burning there. They helped to establish and make this country. They have stood on the field of every battle that has been fought, and they have stood in the arks of peace, in the avocations of civic life, side by side with the man whose grandfather came from the same country only a little while before, and they have made good.

Where is your menace? In what respect have they destroyed us? Were they traitors during the recent war? Are they any worse in morals than the so-called native-born American citizen? Are they any lower in point of education, the second generation, the generation first born here? I say they are not, and the statistics prove it.

Native-born American citizens? How did you happen to be born here? Some of our ancestors were sent over here as indentured servants. Some of our ancestors came here as prisoners. Some of our ancestors came here to escape religious persecution. Many of our ancestors, the great majority of them, came to escape the hard conditions of life in Europe. As soon as a man lands here he turns around and wants to slam the door in the face of somebody else just as good a man as he is, and he calls that Americanism.

Now, we have an argument here that there are certain races of men in which there is a very large percentage of those who are undesirable, and that those undesirables ought to be kept out. I agree to the proposition of keeping out every undesirable. When we establish these boards, if they are properly administered, we can afford to take down all of the doors and let as many come in as come here equipped for American citizenship. But as I look at the diagram on the wall to which I have invited attention I take it that it is intended to demonstrate that immigration from the United Kingdom was all right when it was very large in proportion to the total of the immigrants,

and that it was all right to come from Germany in large numbers; but that the trouble is there has been a diminution of the people from the United Kingdom and from Germany and a larger number of people proportionately have come from the other countries. Singularly enough, the map, which must be a very bungling affair, does not show anything about the menace of immigration that has come from Scandinavia. They are put in with "all others."

What made this change in immigration? Economic conditions in Europe were such that the people of the United Kingdom did not much care to move. Economic conditions in Germany were such that the people of Germany did not care to emigrate in later years. Of course, they have been shut out since the war, and therefore the figures are utterly deceiving, utterly deceptive. Now reverse the economic conditions and you will reverse immigration. There is not a man in this Chamber who does not know that if we were to open the doors to-morrow and say to every German who wants to come to this country and can qualify, "The doors are open," that we would have a large immigration from Germany. So that if it is desirable you can get it by letting them come in.

Let us have no more of this hocus-pocus and false pretense. If you want to keep a German out, say so; but do not put up a map here indicating to me that he was desirable and is desirable, and that there are so few of them coming that that is one reason why we are putting this bill through. You know and I know that with the present economic conditions in Germany, if you will open the doors you will have plenty of immigrants from Germany. Moreover, if we are to judge anything by what we hear of economic conditions in the British Isles, we would have a large increase in immigration from there. We would have a large increase, undoubtedly, from all of the northern countries of Europe, because the applications that have come and the desire to come in from those countries already indicate it.

What about Austria? Is Austria to be condemned? Of course, I am not speaking of present little Austria. Are not the Austrians capable of good citizenship? Among them were the Bohemian, the Czechoslovakian, and different peoples from those smaller countries. Open your doors and see if they do not come. Take off your limitations, but put up your tribunals and let your tribunals say if a man is not fit for citizenship that he can not come in, no matter in what country he was born. That is the proper solution.

Now, I want to give you a little final thought on this that may be popular or may not. When I believe a thing I say it, regardless of popularity. You want to solve the farmers' problem, do you? If you had two or three million more people in this country, two or three million more mouths to feed here at home, you would have mighty little surplus sent abroad, and the farmers' problem would be largely solved.

Moreover, the farmer would be able to get some labor upon his farm at prices which he could afford to pay. The farmer has been undergoing this sort of an experience: The automobile came along and practically destroyed one branch of his industry—the rearing of horses and mules. Practically that has ceased as an industry. Those animals used to eat great quantities of farm products. To-day that avenue of consumption is largely closed. Bring over some human beings to this country. Let them go onto farms, as they will largely go on the farms; let them work for moderate wages, so that the farmer can afford to live. After a while they will begin to get their feet under them and they will, perhaps, become the owners of farms. In the meantime, however, there will have been an increased consumption in the United States, and it will be found at the end of a reasonable period of time that the farm problem will have been largely solved by the creation of a market at home that could consume that much of the products which the farmers raised and save them from the disability of selling their surplus on the broken market of Europe.

It is worth while to think a little about these matters; it is worth while for you men of the South to ask yourselves the question whether you do not need a larger white population in the South. Some question ought to be asked as to what is to solve your labor problem in the South. I do not pretend to instruct you; I do not pretend to say what you ought to do. You know that section better than I know it, and one principle that I have held to is that States ought to be allowed to run their own business, because the people of the State know the business of the State better than the people of the other States know it.

I do know, however, to-day the American farmer has to pay wages that are prohibitive upon his farming industry, as my friend from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON], I think, will bear me out.

Mr. President, this movement is but a part of a general swing. We are going to exclude everybody; we are going to keep this country just for ourselves, we think; but we are simply denying ourselves the wealth of the world, the splendid men and women who want to come to this country and live under our flag and become a part of this great people. You may do it; you doubtless will do it.

As for myself, I would restrict the immigration simply by determining that the individual was capable of becoming and intended to become a good American citizen; that he was capable of amalgamation into our population and into our civilization; that he was well adapted to become a thoroughgoing American citizen. Having done that, I would say to all who desire to come, "The doors are open, and we welcome you." So we shall develop our own country; we shall increase its wealth, its prestige, its power. There will come from other lands men with the genius of painters and artists, men with a capacity for hard work, men and women with a gift for invention and music; and all the adornments and all the utilities of life they will bring over in their brains and in their hearts, just as our fathers brought similar qualities when they entered this land. Our country will become greater and better because of the addition of that kind of people. This movement may be popular to-day, but it is a narrow movement; it is a proscriptive movement, and in a sense it is a destructive movement.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask leave to perfect the pending amendment by the elisions and additions which are shown on the copy which I send to the desk. I ask that the Secretary read the amendment, as I desire to perfect it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania modifies and perfects the amendment which is now pending. The Secretary will read the amendment as proposed to be modified.

The READING CLERK. The amendment as proposed to be modified reads as follows:

At the end of section 8 insert the following:

"On or before March 4, 1926, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly make an estimate showing as nearly as may be the several national origins of the persons who in 1920 comprised the whole population of continental United States, excepting the descendants of such persons as were involuntary immigrants into the territory now included therein. In the preparation of such estimate the said officers are authorized to call for information and expert assistance from the Bureau of the Census, and to receive and utilize any information that may be available from other sources.

"After July 1, 1927, the maximum total number of immigrants that shall be admitted into the United States in each fiscal year shall, unless the Congress shall in the interim provide otherwise, be 150,000, and the annual quota of each nationality shall bear the same ratio to said maximum total number of immigrants as the number of inhabitants of the United States having that national origin shall bear to the whole number of inhabitants other than the descendants of involuntary immigrants. On or before April 1, 1927, said officials shall jointly proclaim and make known the quotas of each nationality, determined as aforesaid, and thereafter the said quotas shall continue with the same effect as if specifically stated herein, and shall be subject to correction and readjustment only if it shall be made to appear, to the satisfaction of said officials, that an error of fact has occurred in said estimate or in said proclamation."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the changes that have been made in this amendment consist in postponing the date for the effective application of the method by one year, making it July 1, 1927, instead of July 1, 1926. Another change in date extends the time for the commission, consisting of three Cabinet officers, to make their report to March 4, 1926, the purpose of that being, in case there should be a change in the administration, to give the new officials ample time to make their report to the Congress. I may say that these changes have been drafted after a conference with the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators on the other side of the aisle, and I understand that with these changes the amendment is now generally acceptable.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HARRISON. On yesterday, or the day before yesterday I believe it was, when the Senator offered his amendment, it carried with it the provision that in 1928 the method proposed in his amendment should apply. The amendment has now been very materially changed, and in view of the modification of the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I

shall withdraw the substitute which I offered, with the expectation of offering the amendment, which I reserved the right to offer when we began the consideration of this bill, to change the basis of the quota from the census of 1910 to the census of 1890.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi withdraws the substitute for the amendment which is now pending.

Mr. WILLIS. May I interrupt the Senator—

Mr. HARRISON. May I say further, before the Senator proceeds, that under the unanimous-consent agreement the vote will come first on the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and then I understand the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] desires that in lieu of 2 per cent, as provided by the committee amendment, he may offer an amendment fixing the percentage at 1 per cent on the basis of the census of 1910.

Mr. WILLIS. If I may interrupt the Senator there, it will not be necessary formally to present the amendment, although it has been pending for some time, because the vote, as I understand, under the agreement now reached, will come first upon the committee amendment in line 10, on page 12, and those who, like myself, favor the 1 per cent provision need only vote against the committee amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, when that question is out of the way—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to remind the Senator from Ohio that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania is the pending amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand that, and I am quite agreeable to that; but after that amendment, as modified, shall have been disposed of, then the question will recur—and if I am mistaken about that I hope I will be corrected by the Chair—upon agreeing to the committee amendment in line 10, on page 12, which will raise the question that I am specifically interested in, namely, to adopt an amendment providing that the quota shall be 1 per cent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands, that is the situation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am going to object to the unanimous-consent request. The logical place for the amendment which I have offered—and I think it was the first amendment offered—is before any of the other amendments which have been presented. As I understand, the agreement proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania would allow a vote on practically every other amendment before voting on my amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia has not caught the drift of what I said. I am not asking for any unanimous-consent agreement whatever, and I believe the Senators who have in mind a vote on the percentage question and on the censuses to be established as a basis would not object to a vote first being taken on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, which proposes total exclusion. It seems to me that logically the Senator from Georgia should have his amendment voted on before we go into the question of percentages and censuses, and I should expect to second his request that his amendment be considered.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not think there is any objection at all to the request of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. With that understanding, then, of course, it is agreeable to me.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I am very greatly interested in obtaining a vote on the committee amendment in line 10 on page 12, but I am quite agreeable to the suggestion now made by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Mississippi that before that is done, the Senator from Georgia may have a vote on his amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think there will be any objection to that.

Mr. WILLIS. Not at all.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, we will get a vote on the amendment to provide total exclusion for five years; we will get a vote on the racial-group proposition; we will get a vote on a 1 per cent quota based on the census of 1910, and we will get a vote on the 2 per cent quota based on the census of 1890.

Mr. WILLIS. Precisely.

Mr. HARRISON. So that the Senate will have an opportunity to express itself by record vote as to which one of the methods they like the best.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is exactly the situation.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. FLETCHER. As I understand, a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and now pending,

even if the amendment should be adopted, will not interfere with the motion the Senator from Mississippi proposes to make?

Mr. HARRISON. Did the Senator from Pennsylvania intend to have a vote to-night? I have not said anything with respect to my amendment. I have been awaiting an opportunity when it might be discussed.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not expect to ask for a vote on the Senator's amendment to-night, but I think we might as well vote on the pending amendment. I do not understand that there is any opposition to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. President, I ask that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], which proposes total exclusion for a period of five years, be now laid before the Senate and be considered next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to that order? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will state the proposed amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, it is proposed to strike out lines 9 to 22, both inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That for the period of five years, beginning 60 days after the passage of this act, the immigration of aliens into the United States is prohibited.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I do not mean to discuss this amendment at length, but I will ask the Senate to bear in mind in voting on it just what the effect of total exclusion will be.

I agree with the Senators who think that the United States can get along very well on its present population. This country is no longer underpopulated; but the amount of immigration which is provided in any of the schemes now proposed for adoption by the Senate is so much smaller than we have ever had before that I feel sure that the United States will not suffer from the amount of immigration provided under any of them, and when we consider the cruelty and the suffering that necessarily will result from the separation of families it seems to me—

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make a statement like that, because it is misleading. I should like to have the Clerk read my amendment. I have exactly the same exception in my amendment, in the very same words, that the Senator has.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have misunderstood the Senator's amendment if it does take care of such cases. I ask that the Secretary state the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will again state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. The amendment proposes to strike out lines 9 to 22, both inclusive—

Mr. HARRIS. That is not the amendment. I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, it is proposed to strike out lines 9 to 22, both inclusive, and to insert the following:

That for the period of five years, beginning 60 days after the passage of this act, the immigration of aliens into the United States is prohibited.

DEFINITION OF "IMMIGRANT"

SEC. 3. When used in this act the term "immigrant" means any alien departing from any place outside the United States destined for the United States, except (1) a government official, his family, attendants, servants, and employees; (2) an alien visiting the United States temporarily as a tourist or temporarily for business, study, or pleasure; (3) an alien in continuous transit through the United States; (4) an alien lawfully admitted to the United States who later goes in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory; (5) a bona fide alien seaman serving as such on a vessel arriving at a port of the United States and seeking to enter temporarily the United States solely in the pursuit of his calling as a seaman; (6) an alien previously lawfully admitted to the United States who is returning from a temporary visit abroad; (7) the unmarried child under 18 years of age, father or mother over 55 years of age, the husband, or the wife of a citizen of the United States; and (8) an alien entitled to enter the United States solely to carry on trade under and in pursuance of the provisions of a present existing treaty of commerce and navigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order that the Record may be entirely clear, the Chair desires to state that the

amendment just read from the desk is the amendment to which the unanimous-consent agreement applies.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. And not the amendment first read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. And not the amendment first read. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask a question? The amendment that was just adopted, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, was to part of section 8. This amendment applies to it in its original form. Does this supersede the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and which was just adopted?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. As I understand, the amendment now pending would supersede subsection (a) of section 8, but would not affect the amendment just adopted as to national origin.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Georgia whether he intends to nullify what the Senate did with respect to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania a few minutes ago?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, there is so much confusion that I could not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. HARRISON. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, that was adopted a while ago, as modified, provides that beginning on July 1, 1927, the number of immigrants shall not exceed 150,000 annually, based on racial groups in this country. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia provides for total exclusion for five years, as I understand.

Mr. HARRIS. That is it, with such exceptions as are stated.

Mr. HARRISON. Consequently, it would nullify the amendment just adopted by the Senate; and the Senator intends to apply his amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the same as to the rest of section 8?

Mr. HARRIS. That is my intention.

Mr. HARRISON. We had better know what we are voting on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROUSSARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. If that Senator were present, however, he would vote as I propose to vote, and I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. Understanding from his speech that he would vote as I have voted, I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FERNALD. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WILLIS. My colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], is unavoidably absent. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. ERNST. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. COLT (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FLETCHER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], who is unavoidably absent. I am informed that he would vote as I have voted, and I will therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McNARY. My colleague [Mr. STANFIELD] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

I also desire to announce that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is absent on account of serious illness in his family, and that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent on account of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—16

Adams	Harris	Mayfield	Sheppard
Caraway	Harrison	Neely	Shields
Dial	Heflin	Overman	Smith
George	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Stephens

NAYS—46

Brandegge	Fernald	McLean	Simmons
Broussard	Fletcher	McNary	Smoot
Bursum	Gerry	Norbeck	Spencer
Cameron	Glass	Norris	Sterling
Capper	Hale	Oddie	Swanson
Colt	Harrell	Pepper	Wadsworth
Copeland	Johnson, Minn.	Philpps	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Kendrick	Ralston	Warren
Dale	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Edge	King	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Edwards	Lodge	Robinson	
Ernst	McKellar	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—34

Ashurst	Elkins	Ladd	Stanfield
Ball	Ferris	La Follette	Stanley
Bayard	Fess	Lenroot	Trammell
Borah	Frazier	McCormick	Underwood
Brookhart	Gooding	McKinley	Walsh, Mont.
Bruce	Greene	Moses	Watson
Couzens	Howell	Owen	Weller
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Ransdell	
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Shortridge	

So Mr. HARRIS's amendment was rejected.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill to-morrow, but I am going to ask the privilege of having the amendment read, for the reason that it may come on for discussion early in the morning. I ask that it may be read, and then be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, at the end of line 22, the Senator from South Dakota proposes to insert:

Provided, however, That it shall be the duty of the Commissioner General of Immigration to ascertain the different racial groups constituting the people of any nation entitled to its quota of immigrants under this act, and the approximate number of people in each of said groups, and when it shall appear that the people of any nation are composed of commonly recognized and well-defined distinct racial groups such quota shall then be apportioned to the several racial groups in the ratio that the number in each such group bears to the entire population of such nation. That immigrants belonging to any racial group shall not be admitted in excess of the number so apportioned, nor shall the number of immigrants from any such nation or country exceed the aggregate of those apportioned to the several racial groups. The Commissioner General shall, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, prescribe all necessary rules and regulations for carrying these provisions into effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask that the committee amendment on page 12, line 10, be now reported. It was the understanding reached, that that is to be the next amendment taken up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the pending amendment. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, line 10, the committee proposes to strike out "200 and in addition thereto 1," and to insert the word "two," so as to read:

SEC. 8. The annual "quota" of any nationality shall be 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in continental United States as determined by the United States census of 1910.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, just a brief statement concerning the parliamentary situation. I had printed an amendment intended to be offered reducing the percentage from 2 to 1. It will not be necessary to call up that amendment, because the same thing can be accomplished by voting down the committee amendment. Those who desire to reduce the percentage from 2 to 1 should therefore vote against the pending amendment.

It will be noted that the secretary properly read some other language; namely, "200 and in addition thereto"; that is to say, the bill provided originally for a minimum quota of 200, but at the bottom, in lines 21 and 22, that is changed by the committee to 100. So the question now involved is simply whether the percentage shall be 2 per cent or 1 per cent, based on the census returns of 1910.

There are two points to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate in that behalf. The argument urged against 2 per cent based on the census returns of 1890 is the fact that it is to some extent discriminatory against peoples coming from certain countries. For example, under the present law there can be an immigration from Austria in the year of 7,300. That would be cut down under the 2 per cent provision based on the census returns of 1890 to 1,100. Under the proposed amendment—that is to say, if the Senate votes against this amendment and makes it 1 per cent—the number would be 2,400.

Take another example. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] some time ago referred to the people of Czechoslovakia. Under the present law 14,000 can come in from that country every year. Under the 2 per cent proposition based on the census returns of 1890 the number would be cut down to 2,000, but under the proposition I am suggesting 4,200 would be admissible.

Take the case of Denmark. Under the present law 5,600 can come in from that country. Under the 2 per cent proposition based on the census of 1890 the number would be cut to 2,900. Under this proposal it would be 1,800.

In other words, the people of no nation can complain, because we are using the basis of the present law, and we propose to apply it to all nations the same. It is a fact that the argument can justly be made against 2 per cent based on the returns of 1890 that it does discriminate in favor of some nations and against others. Indeed, frankly, that is the purpose of that amendment.

I am calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that this proposition, which can be attained by simply voting down the committee amendment, is fair and equitable to all nations.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator, his proposition is to strike out 3 per cent and insert 1 per cent.

Mr. WILLIS. My proposition, and what I hope the Senate will do, is to vote down the committee amendment proposed to be inserted on line 10, which is to insert the word "two." If the Senate will vote that down, then the language of the original bill will stand, making it 1 per cent, if we leave it on the basis of the census of 1910. Of course, there may be other amendments, to change the census; but we are now talking about the percentage.

Mr. KING. The effect of the Senator's amendment would be to restrict immigration to approximately one hundred and fifteen to one hundred and twenty thousand?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; approximately one hundred and fifteen or one hundred and twenty thousand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to make a statement at this point. When this committee amendment was reached in the regular course of procedure, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] offered the following amendment to it: On page 12, line 10, strike out "two" and insert "one," and in that situation the entire subject was passed over. The Chair is bound to recognize the pendency of the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to strike out "two" and insert "one."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I thought that had been covered in the agreement that was reached. Of course, I do not care whose amendment is voted on. I introduced an amendment at the same time, but I may suggest to the Senator from Georgia we will get at the specific thing in which he is interested, and in which a number of us are interested, simply by voting against the committee amendment. I hope the Senator from Georgia will consent to withdraw his amendment, as I have done mine, so as to come at the matter directly.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offered an amendment to shut out immigration for five years. That having been voted down, I would now like to have the percentage reduced to 1 per cent, that being the next best thing. I am perfectly willing to have the Senator from Ohio offer his amendment in whatever form he desires to present it.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will note, what he has in view by the introduction of his amendment and what I have sought to accomplish will be brought about directly by voting against the committee amendment.

There is only one other word I want to say, and that is to answer a question as to the effect 1 per cent will have on the number coming in. To those who are interested in restriction I want to say that this proposition to make it 1 per cent, based on the census of 1910, will make the number admissible practically 120,000 per year, but if it is made 2 per cent, based on the census of 1890, it will be more than that; that is to say, 169,000. The basis proposed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania would make it approximately 150,000. To those who actually want to restrict immigration I will say that this proposition will reduce it to

a smaller number than will any amendment now presented. I hope the Senate will vote against the pending committee amendment, and thus fix the basis at 1 per cent based on the census of 1910.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, on the table there is an amendment which I offered on the 3d of April proposing to change the word "two" to the word "three." Is it proper to present that amendment at this time as a substitute for the amendment suggested by the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has not offered any amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. Is it proper for this amendment to be offered as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question, as the Chair understands it, is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator from Georgia announced his willingness and desire to withdraw his amendment, as I understood him, so the question would be on the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not understand the Senator from Georgia as withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, what I want is to get a vote on the proposition to reduce the percentage from two to one. If the Senator's amendment reaches that result without any complications, I am willing that it should be offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands, then, that the Senator from Georgia withdraws his amendment, and the question is upon agreeing or disagreeing to the committee amendment. The Senator from New York asks if a further amendment to that amendment is in order. A further amendment is in order.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It seems to me that under our unanimous-consent agreement the next business before the Senate is the adoption or rejection of the committee amendment, which is to strike out the words read by the Secretary and to insert the word "two." Under our unanimous-consent agreement no other amendment can be considered until the committee amendments are first disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment suggested by the Senator from New York is an amendment to the committee amendment, and is therefore in order.

Mr. COPELAND. I offer, then, as an amendment on page 12, line 10, that the word "two" be stricken out before "per centum" and the word "three" inserted. I want to speak on that in due time, but perhaps the Senate would like to recess now.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think we might as well recess now, because I know the Senator is very much in earnest about his amendment and I know that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] will oppose anything that has 3 per cent in it. [Laughter.] We will therefore have a long controversy and we might as well recess now.

Mr. LODGE. I understand an agreement has already been made to take a recess at the conclusion of to-day's business.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. An agreement has already been made to take a recess, and if the Senator from New York will yield to me to make the motion—

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I move that the unanimous-consent agreement be carried out and that the Senate take a recess until noon to-morrow.

Mr. COPELAND. I understand that I will have the floor to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to take a recess is not in order as long as the Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I understand it has been agreed that we shall take a recess when the Senate concludes its business to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has not concluded its business.

Mr. COPELAND. I think it hardly fair for me to detain the Senate to-night.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas will state the point of order.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the Chair does not understand the situation. The point of order is that the Senator from New

York [Mr. COPELAND] yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] to make a motion that the Senate carry out its unanimous-consent agreement and take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. That motion is in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not understand the Senator from New York to yield for that purpose.

Mr. LODGE. He yielded for that precise purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON. If he did not do so then, I know he will do so now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York a moment ago, as the Chair understood him, stated that he had not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. COPELAND. I beg the Chair's pardon; I stated I would yield that a recess might be taken.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from New York yield to me now?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate execute its unanimous-consent agreement heretofore made and take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, April 17, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Loving heavenly, heavenly Father—in whose mighty world we are grateful to be awake again—we thank Thee for the morning hour with its new revelation of Thy power and glory. Renew our strength with the birth of each new day. Reveal to us the beauties and the opportunities of life, and may our daily labor become to us a sacrament. Always keep our ambitions and purposes set on worthy objects. O give us the wisdom and the grace to receive Thee to our hearts. This day—so beautiful—may the glory of nature above and the promise of the earth below inspire us to see Thy face and to magnify Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2797. An act to authorize the payment of claims under the provisions of the so-called war minerals relief act.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 2797. An act to authorize the payments of claims under the provisions of the so-called war minerals relief act; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLUM from the Committee on Enrolled Bills reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 655. An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

AN EXPLANATION

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when the immigration bill was up for consideration my colleagues, Messrs. CLARK and DRANE of Florida, were unavoidably absent. I understand they were both paired, but there is some misunderstanding,

and the report has gotten out that they were opposed to the immigration bill. If my colleagues had been present I have been assured, and I can assure the House, I believe, that both of them would have voted for the immigration bill as it passed the House, and therefore I desire to make this statement and have it go in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE TYSON OF ALABAMA

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last, the House made an order setting aside Sunday, May 18, 1924, for memorial services on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOHN R. TYSON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that that order be set aside and vacated and that an order be entered setting aside Sunday, May 25, 1924, for memorial services on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOHN R. TYSON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that Sunday, May 25, be substituted for May 18, for memorial services on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOHN R. TYSON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. It is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the attention of our administration friends on my right to the fact that we have enough Members on this side to transact business this morning. We understand that the public business has been much delayed, and we are ready to help, but they do not seem to come to our aid. I am just suggesting to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that here we are ready to transact the business of the country, and we plead with them that they keep enough Members here to help keep business going.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman believe that 30 Members are enough to transact business?

Mr. BLANTON. That is twice 15.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I not only believe but know that all the time we have been keeping enough over here to help you folks do business, but often you do not have even a handful. It is not tight.

HOUSE OF MEETING TO-MORROW—11 O'CLOCK A. M.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Thanking the gentleman for his assurance that the Members on his side are ready to help transact business, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker; will that be Friday?

The SPEAKER. No; Thursday.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I would object if it were Friday, but as it is I do not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Thursday always follows Wednesday. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House meets to-morrow, after the disposal of matters on the Speaker's desk, I be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to address the House for 40 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. DAVEY. The occasion for this address is the fact that the President of the United States has proclaimed next week as forest-protection week, and I desire to address the House on the subject of trees and their advantage to human life.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. If we are going to continue work on the legislation that is now before us, all right; but the making of addresses of the kind the gentleman wants to make